BIBLIOTHECA INDICA;

A

COLLECTION OF ORIENTAL WORKS

PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF THE

Hon. Court of Directors of the East India Company,

AND THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL.

No. 141.



साङ्ख्यप्रवचनभाष्यम्।

THE

SÁNKHYA-PRAVACHANA-BHÁSHYA,

A COMMENTARY ON THE

APHORISMS OF THE HINDU ATHEISTIC PHILOSOPHY;

BY VIJNÁNA BHIKSHU.

EDITED BY FITZ-EDWARD HALL, M. A.,

Member of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, of the American Oriental Society, and of the Archæological Society of Delhi.

FASCICULUS III.

CALCUTTA:

PRINTED BY J. THOMAS, AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS.

1857.

Price 10 Annas per number, 1 shilling 8d., in England

BIBLIOTHECA INDICA:

A

COLLECTION OF ORIGINAL WORKS

PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF THE

Hon. Court of Directors of the East India Company,

AND THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE

ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL.

साङ्ख्य वच भा ।

THE

SA'NKHYA-PRAVACHANA-BHA'SHYA,

A COMMENTARY ON THE

APHORISMS OF THE HINDU ATHEISTIC PHILOSOPHY;

BY VIJNA'NA BHIKSHU.

EDITED BY FITZ-EDWARD HALL, M. A.,

Member of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, of the American Oriental Society, and of the Archæological Society of Delhi.

CALCUTTA:

PRINTED BY J. THOMAS, AT THE BAPTIST MISSION PRESS.

1856.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

The title which the Hindus apply to their atheistic* theory,

---

* "Cependant, il n'est guère supposable que Colebrooke se soit trompé en disant que Kapila nie l'idée de Dieu. Il n'a fait que reproduire les accusations directes que l'Inde elle-même a portées contre lui; et, comme ces accusations incontestables ne sont pas justifiées pleinement par les slokas de la Kârikâ, il reste que ce soient les Soûtras qui les justifient. Dans aucun de ceux que nous avons traduits, cette déplorable doctrine ne s'est montrée positivement à découvert, mais je crois pouvoir affirmer, dès à présent, qu'elle est en effet dans quelques autres, comme l'affirment les commentateurs indiens et Colebrooke." M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire: Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, pp 271, 272.

Again, of Colebrooke as entertaining the view that Kapila is atheistic: "Il l'avait empruntée lui-même aux commentateurs indiens." Id., ibid., p. 5.

This is scarcely exact. Colebrooke, the last of men to condescend, as a general thing, to statements in train, does much more than "simply reproduce" the charge of atheism against Kapila, "borrowing it from Indian commentators." He refers, by numbers, to several of Kapila's own aphorisms, as being implicitly atheistic; and he translates one of them—I., 92—by the words "there is no proof of God's existence." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 251, 252. See, further, I., 92—99; III., 56—57; V., 2—12, and 46; VI., 64, of Kapila's Aphorisms.

A very cursory glance at Indian commentators, at least on the Sánkhya, would have evinced to M. Saint-Hilaire, that they are, mostly, as delicate as he is himself, in respect of charging Kapila with the denial of God.

In the *Padma-puráṇa*, latter section, *Páshaṇḍotpatti* chapter, Jaimini and Kapila are called sages of the *támasa* order, and their writings are termed *niris'wara*.

is that of Kapila's *Sánkhya*;* this epithet being variously understood, in accordance with the several acceptations of its immediate primitive, *sankhyá*. In the *Mahábhárata*, *sánkhya* is allied to *parisankhyána* and *parisankhyá*, 'exhaustive enumeration.'†

The author of the *Shaḍ-dars'ana-samuchchaya*, a Jaina compendium, corresponding to Mádhava A'chárya's *Sarva-dars'ana-sangraha*, says, in the tone of one who retails a familiar fact:

साङ् निरीश्वराः केचित् केचिदीश्वरदेवताः ।

* *Sánkhya* is the denomination common to Kapila's system and to Patanjali's.

M. Saint-Hilaire, in the opening words of his Analysis of the Sánkhya, confounds the paronymes *sankhyá* and *sánkhya*: "Le mot de Sânkhya, qui est devenu le nom du système de Kapila, signifie *nombre*, et, pris adjectivement, *numéral*. Il signifie encore, dans une acception assez voisine: calcul, supputation, jugement, raisonnement." Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, p. 19.

Dr. Röer also says: "The term *Sánkhya* has two meanings, enumeration and investigation." Lecture on the Sánkhya Philosophy, p. 8.

The word *Sánkhya*, as affording a variety of significations, is made the subject of a laborious pun, in the initial couplet of Bháskara A'chárya's *Bíja-gaṇita*.

† साङ्ख्यज्ञानं प्रवक्ष्यामि परिसङ्ख्यानदर्शनम् । XII., 11393.

Also: साङ्ख्यदर्शनमेतावत् परिसङ् ानुदर्शनम् ।
साङ् ः प्रकुर्वते चैव प्र तिं च प्रचक्षते ॥
तत्त्वानि च चतुर्विंशत् परिसङ् ाय तत्त्वतः ।
साङ्ख्याः ह प्रकृत्या तु नि त्त्वः प विं कः ॥

Ibid., XII., 11409-10.

One of my MSS. reads, in the first of these two passages, *parisankhyánidars'anam*; and, in the second, *parisankhyána-dars'anam*. The same MS. has *sankhyam prakurute* in place of *sánkhyáh prakurvate*. Vijnána Bhikshu, at p. 8, has *sankhyám prakurvate*, and *tena sánkhyáh prakírtitáh* instead of *parisankhyáya tattwatah*. But, be the best readings, among these, as they may, it is abundantly plain, from the context, that Vijnána errs in supposing that any allusion is here made to *sankhyá*, or any cognate word, in the sense of "ratiocination" or the like. Colebrooke, who neglected to pursue the scholiast's citation to the fountain-head, took it, on trust, as correct, and renders *sankhyá* by "judgment." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 229.

Sankhyá, as the proximate source of *sánkhya*, denotes, greeably to a contemporary speculator of some local celebrity, 'enun-

---

Nílakaṇṭha Chaturdhara, in his commentary on the *Mahábhárata*, the *Bhárata-bháva-dípa*, ineffectually labours, with the aid of arbitrary constructions, to gloss away the palpable import of the passages given above. In short, his predilections as a Vedántí reduce his exegetical merit, wherever the system of Kapila is under discussion, to that of perverse ingenuity.

In citing the *Mahábhárata*, or in referring to it, I follow, for convenience, the notation, right or wrong, of the printed edition. But I everywhere verify, or correct, the text of this edition by three very good MSS. which I have consulted.

Colebrooke says: "A system of philosophy in which precision of reckoning is observed in the enumeration of its principles, is denominated *Sánkhya*; a term which has been understood to signify *numeral*, agreeably to the usual acceptation of *sankhyá*, number: and hence its analogy to the Pythagorean philosophy has been presumed. But the name may be taken to imply," &c. Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 229.

Adverting to these words, M. Saint-Hilaire observes: "Colebrooke s'est laissé tromper par l'apparence et par une fausse analogie, en prononçant le nom de Pythagore à côté de celui de Kapila." Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, p. 19.

Again, ibid., p. 20: "Si Colebrooke a eu tort de rapprocher le nom de Pythagore de celui du philosophe indien," &c.

But Colebrooke, as is quite obvious from his guarded and adversative mode of expression, delivers, in the preceding extract, neither his own opinions nor even opinions which, pending the adduction of further evidence, he would be thought to accept. Professor Wilson—*Sánkhya-káriká*, Preface, p. xi.—cites, it is true, the words "and hence its analogy to the Pythagorean philosophy has been presumed," and without comment as to the paternity of the surmise. It may have escaped him that he had formerly written: "The first Indian School, the leading tenets of which are described by Mr. Colebrooke, is the *Sánkhya*, a term which has been understood to signify '*numeral*,' and which, therefore, perhaps suggested to Sir William Jones, his comparison of it to the Pythagorean doctrine." Quarterly Oriental Magazine, Vol. IV., pp. 11, 12: September, 1825.

Colebrooke alludes, without doubt, to the following passage: "On the present occasion, it will be sufficient to say that the oldest head of a sect whose entire work is preserved, was—according to some authors—Kapila; not [?] the divine personage, a reputed grandson [?] of Brahmá, to whom

ciation pursuant to a stated order.'* Another writer holds that it bears the import of 'consideration.'† Elsewhere, it is explained by 'right knowledge;'‡ and the author of the commentary in the following pages, defines it by 'representation of *the real nature of* spirit, on the basis of an accurate discriminative acquaintance *with it, as contrasted with nature.*'§ Consonantly to

---

Krishna compares himself in the *Gítá*, but a sage of his name, who invented the *Sánkhya*, or *Numeral*, philosophy; which Krishna himself appears to impugn, in his conversation with Arjuna; and which, as far as I can recollect it from a few original texts, resembled, in part, the metaphysics of Pythagoras, and, in part, the theology of Zeno." Sir William Jones's Works, Vol. I., pp. 163, 164: 4to ed of 1799.

Sir William, at an earlier period, had pushed his hypothetical analogies much further than this. "Of the Philosophical Schools it will be sufficient, here, to remark that the first *Nyáya* seems analogous to the *Peripatetic;* the *second*, sometimes called *Vais'eshika*, to the Ionic; the two *Mímánsás*, of which the *second* is often distinguished by the name of *Vedánta*, to the *Platonic;* the first *Sánkhya*, to the *Italic*, and the second, or *Pátanjala*, to the *Stoic*, philosophy. so that Gautama [Gotama] corresponds with Aristotle; Kanáda, with Thales; Jaimini, with Socrates; Vyâsa, with Plato; Kapila, with Pythagoras; and Patanjali, with Zeno. But an accurate comparison between the *Grecian* and *Indian* Schools would require a considerable volume." Ibid., Vol. I., pp. 360, 361.

* कस्मात् साङ्ख्यमित्युच्यते। सम्यक् क्रमपूर्वकं ख्यानं क नं यस्यां सा सङ्ख्या क्रमपूर्वा विचारणा। यत् तामधि त्य तं त ात् ाङ्ख्यमित्युच्यते ग्रा म्। Deva Tírtha Swámí: *Sánkhya-taranga*, ad init.

† पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वानां सङ्ख्या विचारः। तमधि त्य तो ग्र : साङ्ख्य इति साङ्ख्यपदव्युत्पत्तिः सङ्गच्छते। Raghunátha Tarkavágís'a Bhattácharya: *Sánkhya-tattwa-vilása*, ad init.

‡ सङ्ख्या सम्यग् ज्ञानम्। तस्मिन् प्रकाशमानमात्मतत्त्वं साङ् ्। S'rídhara Swámí: *Subodhiní*, on II., 39, of the *Bhagavad-gítá*.

Súrya Pandit, the astronomer, annotating, in his *Paramártha-prapá*, the same passage of the *Gítá*, almost copies S'rídhara: ङ् ा सम्यग् ज्ञान ्। तस्मिन प्रकाश्यमा तत्त्वं साङ्ख्यम्।

§ The original will be found near the top of p. 8. As for the italics noticeable in the text, I would remark, once for all, that I use them to distinguish ellipses. Sanskrit vocables, also, when transliterated, I give, as a rule, in the same style of type.

some sacred text, as cited, with approval, by S'ankara A'chárya,* *sánkhya* imports 'ascertainmeut of the truth concerning pure soul.' S'ankara, again, and in like manner taking no account of the etymology of the word, interprets it, on his own authority, by 'the conception that the qualities of purity, passion, and darkness, are perceptible by me; and that I, being distinct from them, am the spectator of their operations, eternal, heterogeneous from the qualities, soul.'†

---

* In his commentary on the *Vishnu-sahasra-náma* from the *Mahábhárata*, XIII., 7006 The definition to which S'ankara accedes, may be from some Purána. It is not to be found in the legal institutes of Vyása, where I had hoped to meet with it. The passage in which this definition occurs, together with the verse which the passage explains, here follow:

महर्षिः पिलाचार्यः तज्ञो मेदिनीपतिः ।

महर्षिः कपिलाचार्य इति सविशेषणमेकं नाम महांश्चासावृषिश्चेति महर्षिः कृत्स्न वेदस्य दर्शनात् । अन्ये तु वेदै देशदर्शनादृषयः । कपिलश्चासौ साङ्ख्य शुद्धा-त्मतत्त्वविज्ञानस्याचार्यश्चेति कपिलाचार्यः । महर्षिश्चासौ कपिलाचार्यश्चेति मह-र्षिकपिलाचार्यः ।

शुद्धा तत्त्वविज्ञानं साङ् मित्यभिधीयते ।

इति व्यास तेः । षिं प्रसूतं कपि ज्ञान्तमिति श्रुतेः । सिद्धा ं कपिलो मुनिरिति स्मृतेश्च ।

† साङ्ख्यं नाम इ स र स्तमांसि गुणा मम दृश्या अहं तेभ्योऽ स्तद्व्यापार ा-क्षिभूतो नित्यो गुणविलक्षण आ ति चिन्तनम् । *Gítá-bháshya*, XIII., 12.

The repugnance of the Vedántís to the Sánkhya can easily be illustrated. The word *sánkhya*, substantive or adjective, occurs, in the *Bhagavad-gítá*, in five several passages: II., 39; III, 3; V., 4, 5; XIII., 24; XVIII., 13. In three of these passages, the first, and the last two, the theory of Kapila is clearly intended. Yet the commentators, who hold, with few exceptions, to the Vedánta, are most averse, in the majority of these cases, from owning that even the existence of atheism is recognised by the poem. In the three instances above mentioned, they, accordingly, explain *sánkhya* by *átman*, *átma-tattwa*, *bhakti-s'ástra*, *Brahma*, *para-pumán*; *sankhyá* being defined, respectively, by *tattwa-jnána*, *adhyátma-s'ástra*, *bhakti*, *upanishad*, *upanishad*. As renderings of the first, we also find *dhyánam*, *jnána*, *paramátma-vastu-viveka*, *paramártha-vastu-viveka*, *vedánta*, and *yathávasthita-vishayayá buddhyá'nu-sanhita-nirnayah* 'a conclusion induced on the cognition of a reality.'

But, whatever may have been the sense originally intended, and perhaps now lost, of the term in question, it is not improbable that it carried a reference, more or less obscure, to the radical independence of scriptural authority, which may be affirmed of Kapila. In the comprehensive spirit of all Hinduism, it is true that he has frequent recourse to Vaidika vouchers* for subordinate articles of belief. Yet, in spite of this semblance of catholicity, it is obvious that the essentials of his system must be justified, if justified at all, rather by an appeal to reason than to revelation. The Sánkhya, indeed, with all its folly and fanaticism, may, for a Hindu school of doctrine,

---

Where Kapila's tenets are, in all likelihood, not alluded to, *sánkhya* is said to mean *bhagavat* and *sannyása; sankhyá* corresponding to *kírtanátmiká bhaktih* and *samyag átma-mati.* Additional synonymes of the former, similarly employed, are *bhakta, bhakti, jnána-nishtha, jnána-nishthá, jnánin, nishpápa-purusha, sannyásin, s'uddhántahkarana,* and *s'uddha-chetas.*

S'ankara A'chárya; *Gítá-bháshya*· Rámánuja A'chárya; *Gítá-bháshya*· Súrya Pandit; *Paramártha-prapá*. S'rídhara Swámí; *Subodhiní* Madhusúdana Saraswatí; *Bhagavad-gítá-gúdhártha-dípiká*. Kalyána Bhatta; *Rasika-ranjaní*. Jayaráma Tarkavágís'a; *Bhagavad-gítá-sárártha-sangraha* Sadánanda Vyása; *Bhagavad-gítá-bháva-prakás'a*· *Pais'ácha-bháshya,* by anon.: Kes'ava Bhatta; *Gítá-tattwa-prakásiká* Rámachandra Saraswatí; *Gítá-tátparya-s'uddhi.*

Of these writers, Rámánuja, Madhusúdana, Sadánanda, and the anonymous author of the *Pais'ácha-bháshya,* refuse to hear of there being any allusion, in the *Gítá,* to the system of Kapila.

Adwaitánanda, in his *Brahma-vidyábharana,* an expositorial work connected with the Aphorisms of the Vedánta, suggests that the word *panchavins'ati,* adduced from the sacred writings as demarking the number of the Sánkhya principles, may intend 20×5 instead of $20 + 5$. In disproof of this conceit, see one of the Sanskrit extracts at p. 2, supra; and the *Mahábhárata,* XII., passim, but, particularly, chapters 307, 308, 309.

* These citations from the Vedas can hardly be referred to a politic affectation of orthodoxy; to the quieting, on easy terms, of the misgivings of the unwary. The Jainas, who go the length of openly denying the divine origin of the Vedas, and who repudiate their authority generally, yet admit it when reconcilable with their own tenets. As. Res., Vol. XVII, p. 248.

be allowed a fair share of circumspection. In its dogmatism it has restricted itself, for the most part, to the supersensuous, a phrase too frequently convertible with the indeterminate. It would, accordingly, often have been difficult to demonstrate that it was not in the right; and it has signified nothing that it was in the wrong: the Hindus never having been known to approve themselves, ethically, any worse for their atheism than for their theism. What is more, the scrupulous vagueness with which it touches on the subject of matter, is, surely, something in its favour. It may have gone widely astray in the cloud-land of metaphysics; but it offers few parallels to the puerile hylology of the Nyáya. It may contravene the spiritual intuitions of humanity; but it has rarely called down the gods from Olympus, to move the derision of modern science. Other praise of the Sánkhya than this, would, however, scarcely consist with the exactions of just criticism. On the assumption that it has come down to us legitimately elucidated, it is next to impossible, notwithstanding its fantastic show of method, to trace, in it, a single vestige of consistency. As apprehended in the present day, correctly or incorrectly, it must, in short, be ranked, with every other, even the most perspicuous, scheme of atheism, as little better than a chaotic impertinence.*

---

* The notion that the existence of God is susceptible of dialectic demonstration, has been surrendered, in later times, by most Christian theologians of any credit: it now being, more ordinarily, maintained that our conviction of deity, on grounds apart from revelation, reposes solely on original consciousness, antecedent to all proof. The idea of God must, indeed, necessarily be postulated as the basis of all human speculation. See Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, passim.

Kant declares that the various objective arguments for the establishment of theism, may be reduced to the teleological, the cosmological, and the ontological. All these, I am told, have been urged, by the Hindus, in combating the Bauddhas, the Mímánsakas, and the Sánkhyas. But further investigation would be requisite before I could produce these arguments, as employed by the Bráhmans, with any approach to a complete exhibition.

Indistinct allusion seems to be made, by the author of the Sánkhya Aphorisms, to anterior* cultivators of the atheistic philosophy, and, in so many words, to 'venerable preceptors'† of the theory. Of the latter, Sanandana‡ alone is specified by name, and once only: but, equally with all the authorities less distinctly commemorated in company with him, his writings, if he ever wrote, have long been forgotten. Panchas'ikha, though, like Sanandana, expressly mentioned, is yet denied his honourable designation. On the first occasion§ where his opinion is reported, it is noted with disapprobation; and, in the sole remaining instance|| where it is brought forward, it is dismissed

---

No one of these arguments makes more directly against such atheism as that of the Sánkhya, than the cosmological proof, or, rather, paralogism; it having been shown to be built on a logical fiction This argument is admirably put by Diodorus of Tarsus, who lived in the fourth century:

* * *εἰ δέ τις ἀγένητον λέγοι αὐτῶν τὴν τροπὴν, τὸ πάντων ἀδυνατώτερον εἰσάγει· τροπὴ γὰρ πάθος ἐστὶν ἀρχόμενον, καὶ οὐκ ἄν τις εἴποι τροπὴν ἄναρχον· καὶ συντόμως εἰπεῖν, τῶν στοιχείων καὶ τῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν ζώων τε καὶ σωμάτων ἡ πάνσοφος τροπὴ, καὶ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ χρωμάτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιοτήτων ἡ ποικίλη διαφορὰ, μόνον οὐχὶ φωνὴν ἀφίησι, μήτε ἀγένητον μήτε αὐτόματον νομίζειν τὸν κόσμον, μήτ᾽ αὖ ἀπρονόητον, Θεὸν δὲ, αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ εὖ εἶναι παρασχόμενον, σαφῶς εἰδέναι καὶ ἀδιστάκτως ἐπίστασθαι.* Photii Bibliotheca, ed. Bekker., p. 209, b.

* * * * For change is an incident that has a beginning; and one would never speak of change as without a beginning. And, to be summary, the all-wise Change of the elements, and of the thence arising animate beings and bodies; and the intricate diversity of forms, and colours, and other properties; all but give forth an articulate voice, *telling us* not to think of the universe as unoriginated, or self-actuated, or, yet, without a Providence; but to know of a truth, and to be unhesitatingly assured, that there is a God, who endowed them with both being and excellent being.

* III, 41. † *A'cháryáh*: V., 31. ‡ VI., 69. § V., 32.

|| VI, 68. Vedántí Mahádeva, annotating V., 32, infers, simply from the name of Panchas'ikha being given in the singular number, that Kapila purposes to mark him as a separatist. The singular must, then, be

with an air of sufferance rather than of approval. Of Sanandana nothing is known further than that he is classed among the mind-engendered progeny of Brahmá.* Panchas'ikha is usually described in the same enigmatical terms:† but the *Mahábhárata*‡ also speaks of him as having had a human mother, Kapilá; and it assigns him to the line of Parás'ara.§

The Sánkhya philosophy is, nevertheless, ascribed, by indigenous tradition, to Kapila,|| the putative author of the atheistic sentences, the *Sánkhya-sútra*¶ and *Tattwa-samása*; though the

---

taken to indicate, as compared with the plural, an inferior degree of respect. But Sanandana, though dignified with the title of *áchárya*, is yet spoken of, by Kapila, in the singular number. Mahádeva's words are: प ञ्चि इत्ये - वचनेन परमतमेतदिति सूचयति । It may, however, be doubted whether the use, in Sanskrit, of the pluralis majestaticus be of any antiquity, notwithstanding Sáyana A'chárya's opinion to the contrary. See Professor Wilson's Translation of the *Rig-veda*, Vol. I., p. 201, foot-note.

* See note at p. 15, infra. † See the same note.

‡ XII., 7895. At XII., 7886, of the same work, it is said:

यमाहुः पि ' साङ्ख्याः परमर्षिं प्र ।पति ।
स मन्ये तेन रूपेण वि ।पयति हि य ॥

'I can imagine that he whom the Sánkhyas call Kapila, the ighty sage, the patriarch, is, in person, under this form, exciting our admiration.'

Such is the unmistakable sense of the couplet; and so thinks Nílakantha Chaturdhara: स पिलः। तेन प शि सञ्ज्ञे । तत्प्रशि ष्य ।त् तत्तुल्यत्वम् । Yet Professor Wilson understands the meaning to be, that Panchas'ikha is here "named .... Kapila." *Sánkhya-káriká*, p. 190. Dr. Weber repeats this mistake: "als auch Kapila heisst." Indische Studien, Vol. I., p. 433.

§ Janaka, chieftain of Mithilá, and disciple of Panchas'ikha, says:

पराशर गोत्रस्य वृद्ध मत्मा नः ।
भिक्षोः प शि ।द्दं शिष्यः पर तः ॥ XII., 11875.

|| In only a single text that I know of, is the Sánkhya imputed to S'iva: *Mahábhárata*, XII., 10388. At the same place, the Yoga also is said to have originated with this divinity.

¶ Swapnes'wara, acquainted as he was with the aphorisms of Panchas'ikha, attributes to him the *Sánkhya-sútra* also. He accounts for its bearing the title of *Kápila*, by the circumstance that Kapila initiated the Sánkhya tradition as set forth in these aphorisms. By way of illustration, he adduces the

accuracy of this assignment rests, it seems probable, on no better evidence than the fact, that such treatises of atheism as existed prior to those attributed to Kapila, being superseded by his own more developed, or less incongruous, enunciations, were consigned, at an early period, to oblivion.

But it does not seem imperative to include, among these ancient productions, the works of Panchas'ikha also.* Even conceding that Panchas'ikha, conformably to the ordinary account of him, was a disciple of A'suri,† who is, in turn, said to have studied under Kapila;‡ yet the measure of a scholastic

---

notorious appropriation to Manu, of the code of laws set forth by Bhrigu. His meaning is, that Kapila only propounded the matter of the *Sánkhya-sútra*, whose present shape is due to Panchas'ikha. He may, then, be supposed to set to the account of humility, the absence from Panchas'ikha's name, in the Sánkhya Aphorisms, of the honorific title of *A'chárya*. Against this it might be argued, that a saint so lowly would be likely to mention, at least a few times, the name of the leading rabbi of his school. Yet, on the contrary, be refrains from all mention of Kapila, while he twice speaks of himself. But, in justice to Swapnes'wara, it should be added that he gives what is repeated above, as nothing but rumour. His words are: पञ्चशिखः खल्वासुरिशिष्यः। कापिलमिति प्रसिद्धिस्तु सम्प्रदायप्रवृत्तेः भृगुप्रोक्तसंहितायामिव मनुसमाख्या।

* Colebrooke judges otherwise. Speaking of the *Sánkhya-sútra*, he says: "It is, avowedly, not the earliest treatise on this branch of philosophy: since it contains references to former authorities, for particulars which are but briefly hinted in the *sutras;* and it quotes some by name, and, among them, Panchas'ikha, the disciple of the reputed author's pupil: an anachronism which appears decisive." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 232.

† *Mahábhárata*, XII, 7890, 7895. Elsewhere, Panchas'ikha is spoken of as having been instructed, with Jaigíshavya, by Kapila himself. *Kúrma-puráṇa*, first section, chapter 9, *s'loka* 119. See, also, the note at the foot of page 16, infra.

‡ *Bhágavata-puráṇa*, I., 3, 11. Also: आदिविद्वान् निर्माणचित्तमधिष्ठाय कारुण्याद्भगवान् परमर्षिरासुरये जिज्ञासमानाय तन्त्रं प्रोवाच। Vyása: *Pátanjala-bháshya*, I., 25. Notice will be taken, in a subsequent page, of the discrepant explanations of the term *ádi-vidwán*, in this passage. But the commentators are unanimous in understanding, by *paramarshi*, Kapila.

descent has no essential correspondence to that of a natural generation. More especially, the position that Kapila takes account of his own literary successor at the second remove, may be granted to offer but little violence to probability, if we simply suppose that the sage originally disseminated his tenets orally, and that they had undergone modification at the hands of sectaries from his proper school, before he committed them to a written form.*

Panchas'ikha is known, by scanty fragments, as the author of a collection of philosophical aphorisms.† One other perform-

---

* As an ungrateful alternative to silence, I have thus attempted to reduce to harmony, materials, in themselves, at first appearance, rather intractable; but which present, it may be, a distorted reflex of historical verity.

As the first step in dealing rationally with the mind-born sons of Brahmá, we must consider them as brethren, not as brothers. But, rather than depart, in favour of common sense, from the strictest letter of the theogonies, I have found the pandits disposed to fall back on their grand solution of all difficulties as to time, space, and individuals, the transparently indolent dogma of cyclical renovations of mundane events. These iterations admitting of an indefinite number of changes as to particulars, any body may, at last, be every body; and it thus becomes a very easy matter to make light of ordinary chronological sequence.

† A single one of them is given, as such, in Vyása's *Pátanjala-bháshya*, I., 3: एमेव दर्शनं ख्यातिरेव दर्शनम्। Kshemánanda, in his notes on the *Tattwa-samása*, twice quotes this as a *sútra*; and Váchaspati Mis'ra, Vijnána Bhikshu, and Nágojí Bhaṭṭa, consent in assigning it to Panchas'ikha,

In Vyása's *Pátanjala-bháshya* we find, at II., 13: स्वल्पः सङ्करः सपरिहारः सप्रत्यवमर्षः कुशलस्य नापकर्षायालम्। कस्मात् कुशलं हि मे बह्वन्यदस्ति यत्रायमावापगतः स्वर्गेऽप्यपकर्षमल्पं करिष्यति। Of this passage, which is uncharacterised, by Vyása, except as being by Panchas'ikha, the *Sánkhya-tattwa-kaumudí* cites the words स्वल्पः सङ्करः सपरिहारः सप्रत्यवमर्षः। Swapnes'wara, in his annotations on the *Kaumudí*, still dissecting, says that the first three of these words form one aphorism, and the remaining word, another.

So much for Panchas'ikha's *sútras*; and it may be questioned whether

ance, if not two, is likewise imputed to him; and he, perhaps,

---

any more samples of them are forthcoming, notwithstanding Colebrooke's assertion that they "are frequently cited, and by modern authors on the *Sánkhya*." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 233.

The next work recorded as by Panchas'ikha, is metrical; unless, indeed, as is quite possible, the longer extracts, to be given after the following couplets, belong, with one or more of them, to a treatise mixed of prose and verse.

ाद्यस्तु ोक्षो ज्ञानेन द्वितीयो राग क्षयात् ।
कृच्छ्रक्षयात् तीय ु व्याख्यातं मोक्षलक्ष ॥

This couplet is quoted, by Vijnána Bhikshu, in his *Vijnánámrita*, with the following introduction: त्रिविधं मोक्षं मेणाह तत्त्वसमासा भाष्ये प शि ाचार्यः। This is the best voucher I have for advancing that Panchas'ikha commented on the *Tattwa-samása*, of which the words त्रिविधो मोक्षः do really constitute a topic. This couplet is again quoted, partially, by Vijnána, in his *Yoga-vártika*, as well as in Bhává Gaṇes'a's *Yogánus'ásana-sútra-vritti*; and in full, by Kshemánanda on the *Tattwa-samása*, in the *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká*, and by Bhává Gaṇes'a in the *Tattwa-yáthárthya-dípana*. Various readings of it are: *ádau* for *ádyas*, *hi* for *tu*; *vimoksho* for *tu moksho*; *kritsna* for *krichchhra*, and *kshayah* for *kshayát*.

Bhává Gaṇes'a, in his *Yogánus'ásana-sútra-vritti*, refers the stanza just given, directly to Panchas'ikha; but the same author, in his *Tattwa-yáthár thya-dípana*, introduces these verses, and the three couplets following, by expressions importing that they were borrowed, not from, but through Panchas'ikha.

पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वज्ञो यत्रकुत्राश्रमे स्थितः ।
टी ुण्डी शि ो वापि मुच्यते नात्र संशयः ॥

Variants: *yatra-tatra* for *yatra-kutra*; *ratah* for *sthitah*; and *muṇḍí ja s'ikhí* and *s'ikhí muṇḍí jaṭí* for *jaṭí muṇḍí s'ikhí*.

प्रा तेन तु बन्धेन तथा वैकारिकेण च ।
दक्षिणाभि ृतीये बद्धो न्तुर्विवर्तते ॥

Variants: *prákritena cha* for *prákritena tu*; and *baddho 'yam tu nigadyat baddho nányena muchyate*, and *bandho 'yam cha nigadyate*, for *badd. jantur vivartate*.

तत्त्वानि यो वेद ते यथावद्गुण रूपाण्यधिदैवतं च ।
वि ु पा ा गतदोषसङ्गो गुणां ु भुङ्क्ते न गुणैः युज्यते ॥

Variants: *chatwári* for *tattwáni*; *swarúpair* for *swarúpáṇi*; *pápo* f *papmá*; and *bhujyate* for *yujyate*.

ιe theistic Sánkhya as well as on the atheistic.

:e couplets and that preceding them, the first and the third quotations, are also found in the *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká.* re cited both there and in the *Sánkhya-sútra-vivaraṇa.* een spoken of above; and the second is in Kshemá- ıttwa-samása, and in Gauḍapáda on the *Sánkhya-káriká.* ervable that Bhává Gaṇes'a does not quote a syllable as Panchas'ikha, that does not occur in the *Sánkhya-krama-* , accordingly, a presumption that Bhává Gaṇes'a took these ιis work, and under the impression that it was by Pancha- suspicion is strengthened by the second exordial stanza of ·rthya-dípana, where its author clearly enough clai s to anchas'ikha on the *Tattwa-samása:*

ह्न्चमात्सम्ब्य व्या ं पञ्चशि च ।
णे : रुते तत्त्वयाथार्थ्यदीपनम् ॥

›n to Panchas'ikha, of the *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká,* if ever ned, would at once be invalidated by indicating the fact, Panchas'ikha is made, in the work itself, supposed free from ıd in such a manner, namely, with the title of *ácharya,* as to ι from its author.

extracted below have, in every case, the guarantee of good ıeir being by Panchas'ikha. They are given, in the first ása, in his *Pátanjala-bháshya,* anonymously: but three of ɑtators; Váchaspati Mis'ra, in the *Pátanjala-sútra-bháshya-* ɑa Bhikshu, in the *Yoga-vártika;* and Nágojí Bhaṭṭa, in the -vritti-bháshya-chchháya-vyákhyá; testify, one, or all, to their s for the passage at II., 22, Váchaspati merely says that it ı authoritative sage; but the two other scholiasts declare it as'ikha.

ान नुविद्यास्मोत्येवं तावत् सम्प्रजानीत इत्येषा द्वयी विम्रो ा-
नाचा च प्रद्गत्तिर्ज्यौति तीत्युच्यते यथा योगिनश्चित्तं स्थितिपदं-

is quoted and expounded by Kshemánanda also, in the *Nava-*

स स्मा नाभिप्रतीन्य त सम्पदमनुबन्द्त्या सम्पदं न्वानस्त
न्यात्मव्यापदं मन्वानः म सर्वोऽप्रतिबुद्ध इत्येषा चतुष्पदा भवत्यविद्या
ानस्य कर्माशयस्य च सविपाकस्य। II., 5.
: रुषमा ारमीलविद्यादिभिर्वि मप न् धीत् तत्रात्मबद्धिं

By the prevalent suffrage of mythology, Kapila* is reputed

तत्संयोगहेतुविव र्नात् स्यादयमात्यन्ति ो दुः प्रतीकारः। ाद्। दुः हेतोः परिहार्य प्रती ारदर्शनात्। तद्यथा पादतल भेद्यता कण्टकस्य भेत्तृत्वं परि-हारः कण्टक पादानधि ानं पादत्राणव्यवहितेन वाधिष्ठानम्। एतत्त्रयं यो वेद लोके स तत्र प्रतीकारमारभमाणो भेदजं दुः ं नाप्नोति। क ात्। त्रित्वोप-लब्धिसामर्थ्यात्। II., 17.

अयं तु लु त्रिषु गुणेषु कर्तृष्वकर्तरि च पुरुषे तुल्यातुल्यजातीये चतुर्थे तत्क्रिया-साक्षिण्युपनीयमानान् सर्वभावानुपपन्नाननुपश्यन् दर्शनं न्यच्छङ्कते। II., 18.

अपरिणामिनी हि भोक्तृशक्ति रप्रतिसङ्क्रमा च परिणामिन्यर्थे प्रतिसङ्क्रान्तेव तद्वृ-त्तिमनुपतति। तस्याश्च प्राप्तचैतन्योपग्रहरूपाया बुद्धिवृत्तेरनुकारमात्रतया बुद्धिवृ-त्त्यविशिष्टा हि ज्ञानवृत्तिरित्याख्यायते। II., 20.

धर्मि ामनादिसंयोगाद्धर्ममात्राणामप्यनादिः संयोगः। II., 22.

रूपातिशया वृत्त्यतिशयाश्च परस्परेण विरुध्यन्ते सामान्यानि त्वतिशयैः सह प्रव-र्तन्ते। तस्मात्सङ्करः। य ा रागस्यैव क्वचित् समुदाचार इति न तदानीमन्यत्रा-भाव. कि केवलं सामान्येन समन्वागत इत्यस्ति तदा तत्र तस्य भावस्तथा लक्षणस्य। III., 13.

तुल्यदेशश्रवणानामेकश्रुतित्वं सर्वेषां भवति। III., 40.

Little can safely be conjectured with regard to the character of the work or works from which these sentences were collected by Vyása. They may be text; and they may be commentary. Probably they are Sánkhya; but, possibly, they pertain to the Yoga. That Panchas'ikha treated of other subjects than the Sánkhya, may be inferred from a remark of Vijnána Bhikshu's: स्वप्रयो नाभावेऽपि विदुषां प्रवृ ा पञ्चशिखाचा वा ाह्य प्रमाणयति। *Yoga-vártika*, I., 25.

* The more ordinary *mánasa*, or mind-begotten, sons of Brahmá vary, as specified in different Puráṇas, from seven to more than twice that number; "but," as Prof. Wilson remarks, "the variations are of the nature of additions made to an apparently original enumeration of but seven, whose names generally recur." *Vishṇu-purána*, p. 48, note 2. One such group is made up of Maríchi, Atri, Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vasishtha; the well-known 'seven Ṛishis.' *Mahábhárata*, XII., 7570 and 13075. This list is modified, in the same book of the *Mahábhárata*, 7534-5, by the substitution of Daksha for Vasishṭha: and, at 13040, by the addition of Manu; thus increasing the aggregate to eight. But, however eked out by Pauráṇika liberality, it is not this catalogue of Brahmá's mind-born progeny that is to furnish us with Kapila.

ɔeen a son of Brahmá; but he is otherwise described as

---

⁷ilson once wrote as follows: "The founder of the *Sánkhya* philo-
amed Kapila; who, as one of the seven great Ṛishis, is one of the
ıhmá. There are other accounts of his origin; but none more satis-
Quarterly Oriental Magazine for Sept, 1825; p. 12. That
anywere styled "one of the seven great Ṛishis," needs confirma-
ıll the emphasis with which other accounts of him are here discre-
ɔthing of this is to be found in the Translation of the *Vishṇu-*

oke,—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 229,—refers to Gaudapáda,
›f Kapila's being ranked as "one of the seven great *Ṛishis.*"
; the collocation of the words in the passage quoted by Gaudapáda,
e has turned subject into predicate. The citation runs thus:
पुत्राः प्त प्रोक्ता हर्षयः । 'These seven sons of Brahmá were
.t *Ṛishis.*'

group of kindred emanations likewise comprehends seven persons.
ɪhábhárata, XII, 13078-9, they are said to be Sana, Sanat-sujáta,
anandana, Sanat-kumára, Kapila, and Sanátana. In the passage
all likelihood from some Puráṇa, near the commencement of Gauḍa-
ımentary on the *Sánkhya-káriká*, Kapila still appears, but as intro-
eral accredited Sánkhya doctors, to the extrusion of as many of his
ociates: the list now standing thus; Sanaka, Sananda, Sanátana,
ɔila, Vodhu, and Panchas'ikha In the *tarpaṇa*, or propitiation-ser-
, least one school of the Veda, that of Mádhyandina, the same per-
ıvoked, and in the same order, except that the names of A'suri and
transposed. See Colebrooke's Miscell. Essays, Vol. I, p. 144. In the
ráṇa, latter section, *Vishṇu-vyúha-bheda-varṇana* chapter, 14, 15,
changes, Kapila himself makes way for another; the set now con-
Sanaka, Sananda, Sanátana, Sanat-kumára, Játa, Voḍhu, and Pancha-
As. Res. Vol. XI, p. 99. The *Kúrma-puráṇa*, former section, chap.
9, with additional alterations, reduces the seven to five; Sanaka,
Sanandana, Rúrú (Rudra?), and Sanat-kumára; whom it qualifies as
s. The first three and the last of these five hold, apparently, pecu-
ıce in the family of Brahmá; since from them, according to Gauḍa-
he forty-third *Káriká*, originated, severally, virtue, knowledge, dis-
ıd irresistible will. The names of these four also occur, unaccom-
if they were to be regarded as representative, at III., 12, 3, of the
-puráṇa.

an incarnation of Vishṇu.* He is also recounted to have been

Sananda and Sanandana are, doubtless, prosodial varieties of the same name; and Játa seems to be put, by metrical licence, for Sanat-sujáta.

In the *Kúrma-puráṇa*, latter section, V., 18, parts of the two classes of Brahmá's mental sons, several new characters being added to the first, are named together, thus: Sanat-kumára, Sanaka, Bhṛigu, Sanátana, Sanandana, Rudra, Angiras, Vámadeva, S'ukra, Atri, Kapila, and Maríchi. But it is worthy of observation that this Puráṇa plainly distinguishes the second class, as to origin, from the first. What is evidently intended for the first class, is detailed, at VII., 35—39, of the former section, as made up of Daksha, Maríchi, Angiras, Bhṛigu, Atri, Dharma, Sankalpa, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, and Vasishtha; and the generation of these individuals, as there given, is very different from what it is in any of the accounts rendered by Prof. Wilson. See *Vishnu-puráṇa*, p. 50, note. For instance, the first and the last four are derived, respectively, from Brahmá's *práṇa, udána, vyána, apána,* and *samána*. See, for these terms, Colebrooke's Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 356 and 374; also the *Sánkhya-káriká*, p. 103. At X., 84, of the same section, the whole eleven are denominated Brahmás; and Brahmá is stated to have created them by his power as a Yogí. See, also, *Vishnupuráṇa*, p. 49.

Further particulars of interest occur at X, 122—125, of the latter section of the *Kúrma-puráṇa*. Sanat-kumára is here said to have instructed Samvarta; and he, Satyavrata: Sanandana, Pulaha; and he, Gautama: Angiras, Bharadwája: Kapila, Jaigíshavya and Panchas'ikha: Sanaka, Parás'ara; and he, Válmíki. This Puráṇa is related, at its conclusion, to have been transmitted from Brahmá as follows. Brahmá communicated it to Sanaka and Sanat-kumára; Sanaka, to Devala; Devala, to Panchas'ikha; and Sanat-kumára, to Vyása.

There is, clearly, no countenance, in the analogy of the Hindu hagiogony, for the else plausible surmise, that a complete history of the *mánasa* sons of Brahmá, might, if recoverable, possibly go to show that the term by which they are known, may originally have borne a less mystical signification than that of mind-born. Its intention could never have been to discriminate the literate portion of the Brahmanidae from their less learned kinsmen

* *Mahábhárata*, III., 1896 and 8880. *Rámáyaṇa*, I., 41, 2—4 and 25. At I., 41, 2—4, Kapila's destruction of the sons of Sagara is predicted *Padma-puráṇa*, latter section, *Vishnu-vyúha-bheda-varnana* chapter. *Vishṇu-puráṇa*, p. 377. *Bhágavata-puraṇa*, I, 3, 11; where Kapila stands the fifth of the twenty-four incarnations of Vishnu. See, also, at p. 6, supra, the verse from

born as the son of Devahúti;* and, again, is identified with one of the Agnis, or fires.† Lastly, it is affirmed that there have been two Kapilas: the first, an embodiment of Vishṇu; the

---

the *Mahábhárata*, XIII., 7006, with S'ankara A'chárya's commentary. See, further, the passage at p. 10, supra, quoted in Vyása's *Pátanjala-bháshya*. The later commentators on this work, Vijnána Bhikshu and Nágojí Bhaṭṭa, understand the word *ádi-vidwán*, or 'primeval sage,' to mean, here, Vishṇu. Váchaspati Mis'ra, though recognising Kapila as an incarnation of Vishṇu, considers 'primeval sage' to refer to the former, reappearing on earth after absorption into the divine essence. The remainder of Váchaspati's remarks are not very intelligible; or else my MSS. are corrupt.

Schlegel, in his note on the *Rámáyana*, I., 41, 3, remarks: "De hoc Vishnûs cognomine et munere non habeo quod expromam. Vix opus est monere plane hinc alienum est *Kapilum*, philosophiae rationalis (*sánkhya*) auctorem, quamvis et hunc discipuli nimis ambitiosi numinis plenum, imo ipsum in mortali corpore praesentem Vishnum fuisse iactaverint. Quam opinionem innuit auctor *Bhagavad-gítae*, Lect. X., 26." It must now appear that the notion which Schlegel here dismisses so peremptorily, is much better fortified, by mythology, than he, to all appearance, apprehended.

* *Bhágavata-puráṇa*, II., 7, 3; and III., 33, 1 The birth of the sage, and of his nine sisters, is here said to have taken place in the house of Kardama, the husband of Devahúti, who is called Kapila's mother. Kapila's father, according to this account, must be Kardama; as there is no hint of anything like a miraculous conception. Kapila, as here described, is, nevertheless, regarded, by some, as having afterwards become an incarnation of Vishnu. Kardama, if not one of Brahmá's mind-born sons, was, at all events, a *prajápati*, or "patriarch." *Vishṇu-puráṇa*, p 50, note.

In Colebrooke's Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 230, Devadúti is, of course, a misprint for Devahúti. Yet Lassen has adopted the former reading. Indische Alterthumskunde, Vol. I., p. 832.

† ग्रु ष्यागतिर्द्देवो यो बिभर्ति ता न ।
कल्मषः क षाणां तौ ोषाश्रित सः ॥
पिलं परमर्षिं च यं प्रा र्यतयः सदा ।
ग्निः स पिलो ना ङ्ख्ययोगप्रवर्त :॥

Mahábhárata, III, 14196—7.

It is the last line of these couplets which, with the exchange of *s'ástra* for *yoga*, is cited at p. 232 of the present work. The 'self-styled Vedántí,' by which epithet Vijnána there denounces some unnamed author, for holding

other, the igneous principle in human disguise.* It must be acknowledged, in short, that we know nothing satisfactory concerning Kapila; the meagre notices of him that are producible

---

that the Sánkhya Kapila was an incarnation of fire, has hitherto eluded my quest.

Prof. Wilson, alluding to this text, of whose source he was unapprised pronounces, touching the identity which it authenticates, that "there does not appear to be any good authority for the notion;" and adds, immediately afterwards: "*Kapila* is a synonyme of fire, as it is of a brown, dusky, or tawny, colour; and this may have given rise to the idea of Agni and the sage being the same." *Sánkhya-káriká,* p. 188 See, also, Colebrooke's Miscell. Essays, Vol. I, p. 230. But it seems just as likely that the conception owed its origin to the fabled combustion, by Kapila, of the sons of Sagara *Mahábhárata,* III., 8881. Also see As. Res., Vol. III. pp. 349, 350, and Vol VI, p 478.

For Wilford's wild speculations in which he identifies Kapila with Enoch, see As. Res., Vol. VI., pp. 473-4.

* I quote at length, as the following passage will, in a subsequent page, again come under consideration:

अथाचानादि ुःकर्मवासनासमुद्रनिपतितानननाथदीनानुद्दिधीषुः पर म पालुः .तःसिद्धतत्त्वज्ञानो हर्षिर्भगवान् कपिलो द्वाविंशतिसूत्राण्युपादिक्षत् सूचनात सूत्रमिति हि त्पत्तिः। तत एतैः मस्त ाना सकलषष्टितन्त्रार्थाना सूचनं वति। इतस्वेदं सकल ाङ्ख्यतीर्थमूलभूतं तीर्था राणि चैतत्प्रपञ्चभूतान्येव। सूत्रष ध्यायो तु वै ानरावतारभगव पिलप्रणीता। इयं तु द्वाविंशतिसूत्री त ा पि बो भूता नारायणावतारमहर्षिभगवत्कपिलप्रणीतेति वृद्धाः।

Sarvopakáriṇí, ad init.

S'ankara A'chárya, in the *S'árîraka-mímánsá-bháshya,* I., 2, 1, also declares for two Kapilas. Implicitly following the *Rámáyaṇa,* he considers the Kapila who destroyed the sons of Sagara, to be an incarnation of Vásudeva or Vishṇu; but he denies the origination, or revival, by him, of the atheistic system. Acknowledging another Kapila, him of the Sankhya, he makes, however, no attempt to ascertain him. The *Bhágavata-puráṇa,* IX., 8, 13, flatly denies that this Kapila could, with his gentle nature, intentionally have slain the sons of Sagara. Yet it makes no doubt that they were destroyed by fire issuing from the body of the incensed ascetic, independently of his volition.

S'ankara A'chárya, commenting on the word Kapila in the *S'wetás'watara-upanishad,* V., 2, proposes two interpretations of it. By one of them it is violently made to intend, as a lame synonyme, Hiraṇyagarbha. Otherwise,

being hopelessly involved in uncertainty, and inextricably embarrassed by fable. Yet it may be credited, with but little hesitation, that he was something more substantial than a myth;* and there seems to be tolerably good ground for receiving, as an historical fact, his alleged connection with the Sánkhya.

---

since primogeniture among created beings is found averred of both Kapila and Hiranyagarbha, they are, to save scriptural consistency, concluded to be one and the same. On the other interpretation, the person named in the text is Kapila of the Sánkhya, a partial incarnation of Vishṇu. For the qualification of him as such, some unspecified Puráṇa is adduced. S'ankara adds that the other Kapila is celebrated in the *Muṇḍaka-upanishad.* This statement is, however, made inadvertently, since no mention of him occurs there. S'ankara probably quoted, after the ordinary reckless Indian fashion, from memory. Dr. Röer has somewhat misrepresented S'ankara, in making him cite suicidally the Puráṇa above referred to. It is vouched, and professedly so, not to corroborate the first identification of Kapila, but to elucidate the second. Neither, in this quotation, is Kapila, "to praise him," "identified with Hiraṇyagarbha." See Bib. Indica, Vol. XV., p 62.

It may be observed, generally, that, in conformity with Hindu usage, none but the figment of one's special idolatry, is glorified as a plenary incarnation.

Kapila, in the *Mahádeva-sahasra-náma-stotra*, *Mahábhárata*, XIII., 1211, is an epithet of S'iva; and expresses, as indicated by the context, 'tawny.'

In an inscription translated by Colebrooke, there occurs the word *kapilá*, which, he observes, "probably is fire, personified as a female goddess." [sic] Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 300, last line; and p. 304, foot-note no. 21. It remains to be shown that the word ever means fire. In this place it bears, undoubtedly, the sense of 'a red cow;' from circumambulating which, great merit is supposed to be acquired "*A red one*] *Kapila*: When applied to a cow, this term signifies one of the colour of lac-dye, with black tail and white hoofs." Colebrooke's Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance, p. 131, second foot-note. For *kapilá* in this acceptation, see the *Mahábhárata,* XIII., 2953, 3535, 3596, 3703-4, 3744, 3764; and, on the subject of circumambulating a cow, see the same poem, XIII., 3436 and 3794.

* Colebrooke comes to a different conclusion. "It may be questioned," he says, "whether Kapila be not altogether a mythological personage, to whom the true author of the doctrine, whoever he was, thought fit to ascribe

The larger of the works presumed to be by Kapila, is comprised in six books of *sútras** or aphorisms, which, as ordinarily

---

it" Miscell. Essays, Vol. I, p 231. But the *Mahábhárata*, in spite of its alloy of fiction, sufficiently attests, it would seem, the reality of the sage; and the *Sánkhya-sútra* and *Tattwa-samása* may be pseudonymous, without vacating the existence of Kapila, or his character of originator, or early promulgator, of hylotheistic doctrines.

In the *Padma-puráṇa*, latter section, *Gaurí-varṇana* subdivision of the *Kumára-sambhava* chapter, Kapila is said to have dwelt in the village of Kalápa. Further particulars regarding this personage can, doubtless, be obtained, if the *Kapila-upapuráṇa*, which is named in the *Kúrma-puráṇa* and elsewhere, be still extant. The *Kapila-sanhitá* may be the same. See the Sanskrit Catalogue of the library of the As. Soc of Bengal, p 72. At p. 26 of this Catalogue occurs the name of *Kapila-smriti*, or legal institutes of Kapila. A work descriptive of certain places of pious resort, and another on naval astrology, attributed to Kapila, have been found in the Peninsula. Mackenzie Collection, Vol. I, pp. 65 and 262.

* Colebrooke—Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 231, 232—unhesitatingly applies the title of *Sánkhya-pravachana* to these *sútras*; but adds—ibid., p. 232—that it "seems to be a borrowed one. at least, it is common to several compositions. It appertains to Patanjali's *Yoga-s'ástra*." Undoubtedly it is borrowed; and I am disposed to date its use in question only from Vijnána Bhikshu. Apart from the writings of this author and of his followers, I have nowhere met with the employment of *Sánkhya-pravachana* in place of *Sánkhya-sútra*, save in the postscript to Aniruddha's commentary, and in that to its abridgement by Vedántí Mahádeva. But the epigraphs to Indian manuscripts are known to be, so generally, the work of copyists, that the adverse evidence of these two seeming exceptions may, very allowably, be neglected.

With regard to the meaning of the term *Sánkhya-pravachana*, which forms part of the title of the present publication, M. Saint-Hilaire could not have done better than consult our commentator, whose explanation of it he seems, however, to be unacquainted with. At p. 5 of his Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, he translates these words by "Préface ou Introduction au Sânkhya." Sooth to say, this would be a strange sort of name for a complete dogmatic enunciation, by any philosopher, of his own theory; especially if, as happens with the Sânkhya, the theory leaves almost no room for legitimate evolution.

read, amount to five hundred and twenty-six.* Its fourth book is chiefly made up of proverbial sayings and brief hints of

---

Mistaken as Vijnána probably is, in arguing that the *Tattwa-samása* not only preceded the *Sánkhya-sútra*, but formed its germ, there is no ground to mistrust his etymological analysis of the word *pravachana* as here used. At p. 7 of the present work, he explains it by *prakarsheṇa nirvachanam* 'detailed exposition;' and, at p 110, by *prapancha* 'explication.' Its import is, therefore, interpretation.

Vijnána, in the *Pátanjala-bháshya-vártika*, 1st *adhyáya*, ad fin., again defines the term *sánkhya-pravachana*—as the proper name, according to Vyása, of the Yoga Aphorisms—by words expressing 'detailed exposition:' साङ्ख्यप्रवचन इति । साङ्ख्यशास्त्रस्यैव प्रकर्षेण वचनं साङ्ख्यप्रवचनम् । Nagojí Bhatta, in his *Pátanjala-sútra-vritti-bháshya-chchháyá-vyákhyá*, silently transcribes Vijnána's derivation: एतस्य साङ्ख्यप्रवचनत्वं तु साङ्ख्यशास्त्रस्यैव प्रकर्षेण वचनात् ।

Had M. Saint-Hilaire not permitted his dependence on Colebrooke to supersede reference to Vijnána, he would have found that, on the statement of the latter, the *Sánkhya-pravachana* came after the *Tattwa-samása;* and that neither of them is described as standing to the other in a relation similar to that of preface. Further on I shall take up this point again.

* That is to say, in the six books, 164, 47, 84, 32, 129, and 70, respectively. As for this enumeration, even if it had not the support, by express declaration, of annotators, yet the tenor of their scholia would, in general, authorize it with sufficient distinctness But it is expressly supported, by notation, in all the copies of the pure text that I have consulted, and in most of the MSS. of Vijnána's commentary and of Nagojí Bhatta's abstract of it, that I have collated. Aniruddha, and his epitomist Mahádeva, of whose works such MSS. as I have examined likewise have the aphorisms numbered, concur, essentially, in the forementioned distribution and aggregate. The only difference which they discover, consists in halving the 121st aphorism of book V.; thus bringing out the sum total, 527. See p. 207 of the present publication, and p. 33 of its appendix.

M. Saint-Hilaire, precipitately accepting, without diplomatic verification, the Serampore edition of Vijnána's commentary, and unvisited by any the least suspicion of its faultlessness, computes the Sánkhya aphorisms, in the six books, at 156, 46, 76, 30, 122, and 69; in all, 479. See Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, p. 6. The consequence, to his essay, of this want of circumspection and research, is not very advantageous. Neither need one be sur-

legends, illustrative of Sánkhya topics; and its fifth is polemic, being devoted to a formal defence of the atheistic scheme. In

---

prised that, leaning on the old edition of Vijnána, he should write thus: "Isvara Krishna, imbu des opinions de son temps, aurait pu prêter à Kapila des pensées qui ne seraient pas les siennes." Ibid., p. 69. The result of the otiose confidence above animadverted on, may in part be gathered from the particulars about to be noted.

In the edition received by our essayist, I, 61 is lost in the commentary; and yet the 22d *káriká* is, in good part, composed of it. With the same memorial couplet, VI., 32, also, is connected: but this aphorism, with most of the explanation of it, is omitted altogether.

I., 87, which is degraded to commentary, fixes the number of the proofs admitted by the Sánkhya, as stated in the 4th *kariká.*

I., 118, which is in the same predicament with the aphorism last named. forms part of the 9th *káriká.*

I., 141, similarly circumstanced, may be found embodied in the 17th *káriká.*

I., 162, which is given as commentary, upholds the 62d *káriká*

M. Saint-Hilaire would have quoted II., 28, after the 28th *káriká,* had it not been omitted—with nearly all its commentary.

He would, also, at p. 444, have cited III., 18 and 19, if they had not been printed as shreds of scholia.

The 50th *káriká* receives support from III., 43, which is, likewise, disguised by small type.

Commenting on the 54th *káriká,* M. Saint-Hilaire employs language which significantly implies the entire and unquestioning reliance on the old edition of Vijnána, which has above been alleged of him. His words are as follows:

"Lecture 3, soûtra 44 [48]: 'En haut, il y a prédominance de la bonté.'

"Kapila ne va pas plus loin; et après avoir indiqué, comme on l'a vu, l'existence des trois mondes en n' indiquant que le monde des dieux où règne la bonté, il ne dit point quelle qualité prédomine dans les mondes qui viennent après celui-là. Il est probable que la Kârikâ, en faisant prédominer l'obscurité dans le monde inférieur, et le mal dans le monde du milieu, se conforme à une tradition dès longtemps reçue; mais, dans les axiomes du maître, ce complément à peu près indispensable de sa pensée n' apparaît pas, et il n'en a rien exprimé, pas même par une de ces réticences qui lui sont si habituelles. Il faut ajouter que le commentateur des Soûtras, Vidjnâna Bhikshou, ne s'est pas arrêté d'avantage à la doctrine que nous retrouvons

addition to its special section of controversy, it, also, here and there, prefers in direct terms, or else darkly points to, exceptions

---

dans la Kârikâ, et qu'à la suite de Kapila il a omis de parler des deux autres mondes, placés au-dessous du monde supérieur. Il se borne à dire que par 'en haut' Kapila comprend le monde qui est au-dessus de la terre habitée par les mortels." Premier Mémoire, &c., pp. 213, 214.

The restoration of III, 49 and 50, which, with the explanation of them, do not appear in the Serampore impression of Vijnána, at once accounts for several items of the 54th *káriká*, and completely frustrates the criticism, just quoted, which our essayist ventures.

III., 53, which is reduced to commentary, is repeated, mostly, in the 55th *káriká*.

To illustrate the 68th *káriká*, M. Saint-Hilaire cites, instead of III., 56, which is omitted, the explanatory expansion of it.

"Colebrooke a fait remarquer (*Essays*, tom. I., page 232) que les Soûtras attribués à Kapila mentionnaient le nom de Pantchasikha. Le fait est exact, et Colebrooke en tirait cette double conséquence: d'abord, que les Soûtras n'étaient pas de Kapila lui-même, car il n'aurait pas cité le nom de son disciple, et, en second lieu, qu' il y avait pour le Sânkhya des autorités antérieures aux Soûtras, puisqu'ils invoquaient eux-mêmes le témoignage d'un maître plus ancien qu' eux. J' admets les deux conséquences signalées par Colebrooke. Mais il aurait dû ajouter que la citation rapportée par lui se trouve dans l'avant-dernier soûtra de tout le système. (Lecture 6, soûtra 68). A' cette place, les interpolations ont été plus faciles certainement que dans le corps même de l'exposition, et il est fort possible qu'une main étrangère ait glissé celle-ci à la fin de l'ouvrage. Cette simple indication du nom de Pantchasikha ne nous apprend d'ailleurs absolument rien sur la vie de ce personnage, elle ne fait que consacrer le souvenir d'une de ses doctrines." Premier Mémoire, &c, pp 253, 254.

Now, in the first place, the suggestion broached by M. Saint-Hilaire, that VI., 68, as being the penultimate aphorism of the *Sánkhya-sútra*, may, not improbably, be an interpolation, is weakened by the fact that it is followed by two aphorisms instead of one, and his objection now lies, by his line of argument, more directly against the text commemorating Sanandana,—VI., 69,—which, in his reading of Vijnána, is consigned to the notes. Again, both he and Colebrooke failed to observe V., 32, which, likewise, in Vijnána, as received by the former, is simply a scantling of commentary. The rest of M. Saint-Hilaire's reasoning, the bulk of which is, with such a lofty air

objected by a fictitious postulant, or protagonist; appending, in antidote, the appointed solution of the difficulty suggested. In this procedure it is nowise singular among compositions of its order. Neither is it the only sample, in Indian literature, of an aphoristic treatise that possesses but slight pretensions to method. It abounds, moreover, in repetition. As compared with the aphorisms of the other philosophical schools, to those of the Sánkhya may, however, with all their elliptical obscurity, be conceded no inconsiderable credit for the degree in which they define their own tenor. In this respect they present, indeed, an observable contrast to the *sútras* of the Vedánta, to go no further; and the rationale of this contrast appears to be of no arduous discovery. As the creed purporting to represent the Vedas constituted the established faith, a compendium of its dogmas could securely count on a dispensation from that punctual scrutiny which would inevitably attend the symbol of a schism.* To the first would be wanting certain inducements

---

of patronage, avowedly adopted from Colebrooke, has been dealt with already. See above, pp. 10, 11.

Once more, our essayist would, in expounding the 57th *káriká*, have cited VI., 40, had it not, in the old edition of Vijnána, been accounted expositorial; a part of the introduction to it being, there, put in its place.

* Nílakantha Chaturdhara, in his *Shat-tantrí-sára*, enumerates, as *ástika* or orthodox systems of philosophy, the *Mímánsá, Tarka,* and *Vedánta*; and, as *nástika* or heterodox, the *Chárváka, Saugata,* and *Árhata* The *Tarka*, of the first class, he subdivides into the *Sánkhya, Pátanjala, Vais'eshika,* and *Nyáya*; and the *Saugata*, of the second class, into the *Sautrántika, Vaibhashika, Yogáchára,* and *Mádhyamika.*

Proceeding to particulars, this writer gives some account of a singular theory, additional to those above named, by one Mis'ra. As never having been alluded to by any European writer, it may be thought not undeserving of a summary note.

The most remarkable characteristic of this theory consists in the exotic innovation of doing away with the ultimate resolution into the primal cause, of matter and all subaltern forms of intelligence. The diverse allotment, to different mortals, of mundane fruition, in the case of original appearances

to precision, which could scarcely fail to weigh gravely with the other; and, if acceptable in the gross, it might easily be entrusted to the casual care of expositors, for the redress of its laxities. As for the second, on the other hand, as anticipating every species of opposition, its compiler would industriously labour to diminish the chances of conflict, by, first of all, studying to avoid ambiguity; and, further, the proselyte to a new belief would naturally be solicitous for a precise enunciation of the tenets he had received in return for those he had discarded. Accordingly, though the aphorisms of the Vedánta may have been posterior to those of the Sánkhya, there seems good reason why the first should not have striven so strenuously as the other, against the hazard of misconstruction. That the latter is by no means so capable of various interpretation as the former, is incontestable. That it would prove to be so, might, perhaps, even be argued from the consideration that the Sánkhya has never, within historical knowledge, lapsed from unity; whereas

---

on the stage of life, is referred, by it, to the influence of the face of the horoscope at conception and birth. The preeminently devout are, at death, translated to a place of bliss, and are thenceforth exempt from earthly vicissitudes. Ignorant evil-doers are consigned, by divine messengers, to a region which is vaguely said to be inferior to paradise; and their resurrection in this world, or other subsequent change of state, appears to be unprovided for. Conscious transgressors are tormented in the flames of Tartarus, till the beginning of a new cycle; and are then reendued with their former bodies. With these persons, the deeds of the past life have, declaredly, a retributive efficacy. Such as presumptuously pretend to oneness with the Deity,—by whom the Vedántís are plainly signified,—suffer, in their subtile frames, the dolors of perdition, till the end of the current day of Brahmá; and are then ejected from their gross corporeal investments. This last expression is unintelligible; and the text is, here, very likely, adulterated.

Mis'ra, on the representation of his critic, lays claim to one or more Upanishads, a Purána, and the *Udas'aráva-bráhmana*, as lending colour to his sentiments. Two branches from his proper school are hinted at; their deviation from the heresiarch being intimated to hinge on the nature of the godhead. Nílakaṇṭha truculently retaliates the severity of Mis'ra to-

the Vedánta has notoriously ra ified into several distinct and irreconcilable denominations.*

As already remarked, besides the book of aphorisms just dis-

wards Vedántís, by denying to him and to his followers, every prospect of reaching the sphere of Brahmá. He refuses them fellowship with the Hindu communion; and reviles them, under the epithet of 'brutes of the Lord,' for impiously maintaining that celestial blessedness is attended with a sense of selfhood.

The bare title of Mis'ra is usually appropriated, I learn, to Váchaspati Mis'ra the jurist. Here, however, it may, possibly, designate the elder writer of the same name, the pneumatologist. As conducing to sustain this conjecture, I may mention a rumour, prevalent among the learned Hindus of Central India, that this writer, late in life, put forth a disquisition, believed to have perished, on incognisable matters generally; in which, no doubt scandalizing the conservatism of his age, he evinced a marked disposition to think, within limits, for himself. At all events, the origination, on Indian soil, of a system that strikes at the very root of pantheism, is a phenomenon well worthy of remark. It may, indeed, almost be taken to imply an acquaintance with some religion of the West; though, in teaching that creation, sentient and inert, proceeds from the Deity as a seed, it is evident that Mis'ra had not risen to the Christian and Muhammadan dogma of genesis without a material cause. His implied restriction to the human species, of a future life, is, also, a striking reduction of the range accorded, by most oriental nations, to the economy of metempsychosis.

Of Nílakantha's *Shat-tantrí-sára* I have been able to procure only the fourth and last chapter, and but a single copy of this fragment. The treatise is in verse, with a prose paraphrase and a commentary; the whole by the same author. It is said to have been written within the last century and a half.

* Notwithstanding their fundamental disparity, a general similitude pervades the Sánkhya and the Yoga. In some of the earliest authorities they are, also, repeatedly mentioned in combination. Their interdependence, likewise, is incontrovertible. That the Yoga implies the existence of the Sánkhya, does not require to be proved; and a reference to the *Sánkhya-sútra* equally discovers that it contemplates not a few of the fanatical notions and practices detailed in the aphorisms of the Yoga. It may, therefore, not unreasonably be concluded that the Sánkhya and the Yoga, whatever their era, or the age of their supposed earliest text-books, were of nearly contemporaneous origin.

missed, a scanty index* to the topics of the Sáukhya, entitled *Tattwa-samása*, is referred to Kapila. The articles that make

* The distribution of the Sánkhya system into twenty-five cardinal principles,—namely, eight producers, sixteen productions, and spirit,—is as old as the *Mahábhárata*. See foot-notes to pp. 2 and 6, supra. The crazy digest of these principles, laid down in the *Bhágavata-puráṇa*, III., 26, 10 seqq., argues forcibly the recent origin of this crude farrago.

The topics of the Sánkhya, as diversely exhibited in the several editions of the *Tattwa-samása*, will receive full attention presently. But another classification of these topics, which computes them at sixty, is propounded in the commentaries on the *Tattwa-samása*, and in the *Rája-várttika* as quoted in the *Sáukhya-kaumudí* and *Sarvopakáriṇí*. The passage from the *Rája-vártika* runs as follows:

प्रधानास्तित्वमेकत्वमर्थवत्त्वमथान्यता।
पारार्थ्यं च तथानैक्यं वियोगो योग एव च॥
शेषवृत्तिरकर्तृत्वं मौलिकार्थाः स्मृता दश।
विपर्ययः पञ्चविधस्तथोक्ता नव तुष्टयः॥
करणानामसामर्थ्यमष्टाविंशतिधा मतम्।
इति षष्टिः पदार्थानामष्टाभिः सह सिद्धिभिः॥

Fifty of these topics, the 'intellectual creation,' offer no difficulty, at least in the immediate subdivisions of this aggregate. These are: the five species of obstruction, the nine of acquiescence, the twenty-eight of disability in the organs, and the eight of perfection. The remaining ten are: (1) the existence, (2) the simplicity, (3) the objectiveness, and (4) the subservience, of nature; (5) the distinctness, (6) the multeity, and (7) the passiveness, of spirit; (8) the disjunction of nature from spirit, (9) the conjunction of nature with spirit; and (10) the continuance of the body after the acquisition of saving knowledge.

Prof. Wilson—*Sánkhya-káriká*, pp. 191-2—completes, in some sort, this set of ten 'radical facts;' but only by copying Váchaspati where he supplements the text, and by misunderstanding him both there and elsewhere. Váchaspati connects 'existence' with both 'spirit' and 'nature;' and yet in order to make but one category of the whole, namely, 'the existence of spirit and nature.' Prof. Wilson makes two: "existence of soul" and "existence of nature." Again, Váchaspati explains *s'esha-vṛitti*, by *sthiti*, which he refers to *sthúla* and *súkshma*. Prof. Wilson, dividing, as before, gives two categories, "duration of subtile" and "that of gross." *Viyoga* and *yoga* are left, by Váchaspati, unexplained, as being too obvious to demand elucidation. Prof. Wilson throws them out altogether.

up this jejune catalogue, are misnamed *sútras*;* and their number, as fixed by different commentators, ranges from twenty-two to twenty-five. On the strength of internal evidence, their posteriority to the larger aphoristic treatise is scarcely matter

---

The commentaries on the *Tattwa-samása* cite the ensuing couplet for an enumeration of the ten radical facts:

अस्तित्वमेकत्वमथार्थवत्त्वं पारार्थ्यमन्यत्वमकर्तृता च ।
योगो वियोगो बहवः पुमांसः स्थितिः शरीर   च शेषवृत्तिः ॥

The term *astitwa* 'existence,' here used, is explained by the other commentators as it is by Váchaspati. *Vis'esha-vrittih* is, in some MSS., substituted for *cha s'esha-vrittih.* Its import is represented as above. See, regarding it, the sixty-seventh *káriká* of I's'wara Krishna.

In an anonymous marginal note to one of my MSS. of the *Sánkhya-káriká*, I have found the verses given above from the *Rája-vártika*, with the following stanza in place of their first couplet and a half:

पुरुषः प्र तिर्बुद्धिरहङ्कारो गुणा यः ।
त ात्रमिन्द्रियं भूतं मौलिकार्थाः स्मृता दश ॥

Here the fundamental categories are: (1) spirit, (2) nature, (3) intelligence, (4) egotism, (5-7) the three qualities, (8) the subtile elements, (9) the organs, (10) the gross elements. See, also, the *Sánkhya-káriká*, p. 192.

* The *Sarvopakáriní* commentary counts but twenty-two; as follows:
ष्टौ प्र तयः ॥ १ ॥ षोडश विकाराः ॥ २ ॥ पुरुषः ॥ ३ ॥ त्रैगुण्यसञ्चरः ॥ ४ ॥ प्रतिस रः ॥ ५ ॥ अध्यात्मम् ॥ ६ ॥ अधिभूत ॥ ७ ॥ अधिदैवम् ॥ ८ ॥ पञ्चाभिबुद्धयः ॥ ९ ॥ पञ्च कर्मयोनयः ॥ १० ॥ पञ्च वायवः ॥ ११ ॥ पञ्च कर्मात्मानः ॥ १२ ॥ पञ्चपर्वाविद्या ॥ १३ ॥ ष्टाविंशतिधाशक्तिः ॥ १४ ॥ नवधा तुष्टिः ॥ १५ ॥ अष्टधा सिद्धिः ॥ १६ ॥ दश मूलि ा ाः ॥ १७ ॥ अनुग्रहसर्गः ॥ १८ ॥ चतुर्दशवि धो भूतसर्गः ॥ १९ ॥ त्रिविधो बन्धः ॥ २० ॥ त्रिविधो मोक्षः ॥ २१ ॥ त्रिविधं प्रमाणम् ॥ २२ ॥ एतद् याथातथ्यम् । एतत् सम्यग् ज्ञात्वा त त्यः स्यान् न पुनस्त्रिविधेन दुः नाभिभूयते ।

The topic *traigunya-sanchara* is given as two, in all the other commentaries. It is only by this bisection that the *Sánkhya-sútra-vivarana* differs from the *Sarvopakáriní*; and thus exhibits twenty-three so-called *sútras*.

The *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká* recites, at its commencement, twenty-five topics; but by obvious error; as it reduces them to twenty-four, by foregoing all exposition of the words *trividho dhátu-sargah*, which occur after the topic given above as the nineteenth. The MS. from which Dr Ballantyne printed the work in question, seems to be peculiar in reading *trividho dhátu-san-*

of uncertainty;* and they add nothing to our knowledge of Kapila's system, except in having elicited annotations which lay

---

sargah. In the preface to the *Sánkhya-tattwa-vilása,* where the *Tattwa-samása* is quoted, as if from the *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká,* and briefly explained, the expression *trividho dhátu-sargah* is explained by the words *váta-pitta-kapha-bhedát trividhah,* as intending the assemblage of wind, choler, and phlegm. Colebrooke, by the way, translating from Jagannátha Tarkapanchânana, mistakes in construing the term *dhátu-vaishamya* by "pernicious power of mineral drugs." Digest of Hindu Law, &c., Vol. III., p. 304: 8vo. ed. Cf. Colebrooke's Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance, p. 361, para. 2. The exact equivalent is, in our antique medical nomenclature, 'distemper of the humours.' The Hindu physiology reckons the humours at three only.

The *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká* gives, after no. 22 as above, the words *trividham duhkham,* as a topic.

The reading of the *Tattwa-yáthárthya-dípana* corresponds to that of the *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká,* barring its rejection of *trividho,* &c., and its considering the words *etad yáthátathyam* as a topic, thus actually giving twenty-five as the total.

Kshemánanda, in his annotations on the *Tattwa-samása,* states that it contains twenty-five topics: but he enumerates only twenty-four, his text being, as far as the words *etad yáthátathyam,* identical with that of the *Tattwa-yáthárthya-dípana.*

The *Tattwa-samása* is generally found appended to Vedántí Mahádeva's *Sánkhya-vritti-sára,* and according to the reading of the *Sarvopakáriní.* Mahádeva, however, perhaps for the sake of shortness, omits the two sentences by which the topics are usually followed.

The eighth topic is read, in the *Sánkhya-sútra-vivarana, adhidaivam cha;* and *adhidaivatam cha,* in the *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká,* in the *Tattwa-yáthárthya-dípana,* and in Kshemánanda on the *Tattwa-samása.* The *Sarvopakáriní,* in its seventeenth topic, is unique in preferring *das'a* to *das'adhá.*

Of the *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká* I have collated five MSS.

* The anonymous author of the *Sarvopakáriní* relates, as an ancient tradition, that Kapila the incarnation of Vishnu composed the *Tattwa-samása,* and that, in aftertimes, another Kapila, a manifestation of the divinity of fire, put forth the larger Sánkhya Aphorisms, of which the 'Compendium of Principles' is the rudiment. The same tradition makes the doctrines of other, unnamed, philosophical schools, besides the Sánkhya, no less than the 'Collection of Six Books,' to have sprung from the *Tattwa-*

under contribution sources presumed to be, in their integrity, no longer forthcoming.

---

samása. These observations will be found, in the Sanskrit, in a foot-note to p. 18, supra.

Vijnána Bhikshu says: 'If it be alleged that the *Tattwa-samása* aphorisms are simply recited in the Collection of Six Books, the answer is, that it is not so. There is no mere repetition among them; inasmuch as they are, respectively, concise and expanded. Hence, the appellation of *Sánkhya-pravachana* is appropriate for the Collection of Six Books, in like manner as it is for the Institute of the Yoga. The former embraces precisely a detailed exposition of the *Tattwa-samása*, the shorter Sánkhya Institute. There is this difference, however, that the Collection of Six Books only expands the subject-matter of the *Tattwa-samása;* whereas the Institute of the Yoga avoids *their seeming* deficiency, by *expressly* propounding God, whom both *the other works*, by concession for sake of argument, deny.' For the original of this extract, see page 7 of the present work.

Our commentator, at p. 110, grows more confident; passing from the language of assumption, as it were, to that of positive assertion: 'This Institute, equally with that of the Yoga, as being a developement of the substance of the shorter Sánkhya Aphorisms, is designated *Sánkhya-pravachana, or, Explication of the Sánkhya.*'

Colebrooke, having in view a portion, if not all, of these remarks, writes as follows: "It appears, from the preface of the *Kapila-bháshya*, that a more compendious tract, in the same form of *sútras* or aphorisms, bears the title of *Tattwa-samása*, and is ascribed to the same author, Kapila. The scholiast intimates that both are of equal authority, and in no respect discordant. one being a summary of the greater work, or else this an amplification of the conciser one. The latter was probably the case; for there is much repetition in the *Sánkhya-pravachana.*

. . . .

"If the authority of the scholiast of Kapila may be trusted, the *Tattwa-samása* is the proper text of the *Sánkhya;* and its doctrine is more fully, but separately, set forth by the two ampler treatises entitled *Sánkhya-pravachana*, which contain a fuller exposition of what had been there succinctly delivered." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 231, 232.

Dr. Roer,—Journal of the As. Soc. of Bengal for 1851, p. 402, note,—after citing the latter of the paragraphs given above, unaccountably adds: "but this is a misapprehension: the scholiast does only say: 'they are of equal authority, one being a summary of the greater work, or else this an

The commentaries on the *Sánkhya-sútra* are as follows:

I. The *Aniruddha-vṛitti*, by Aniruddha.* Of this author's history I know nothing.

II. The *Sánkhya-vṛitti-sára*, by Mahádeva Saraswatí,† more

---

amplification of the conciser one.'" On the contrary, as will have been seen, the scholiast allows no such alternative, and is responsible for only the second member of it. Colebrooke would seem to have misunderstood the word *ubhayoh;* and he has, besides, made out Vijnána to be self-contradictory. At the same time, the clause to which Dr. Roer excepts, is almost a literal translation of Vijnána's own words.

M Saint-Hilaire says, speaking of the Sánkhya Aphorisms: "Ce traité, quoique assez court, a été abrégé, dit-on, par Kapila, sous le titre de Tattva-Samâsa, c'est-à-dire, réduction substantielle du Sânkhya. Nous ne connaissons ce dernier ouvrage que par les citations qu'en ont faites les commentateurs, et qu'a répétées Colebrooke d'après eux (*Essays,* tome I., p. 231)." Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, p. 5.

Here, again, Colebrooke is implicitly followed as translator of Vijnána; at what cost, will already have appeared. Moreover, the phrase "reduction substantielle" scarcely answers to *Tattwa-samása;* and Colebrooke would be explored in vain for a single quotation from the smaller treatise.

Vijnána plainly rests the validity of adjudging the title of *Sánkhya-pravachana* to the *Sánkhya-sútra*, on the ground that these aphorisms are an expansion of the *Tattwa-samása;* the *Tattwa-samása* being, again, the embryo of another collection of aphorisms called *Sánkhya-pravachana*,—those of the Yoga. But this derivation of the *Yoga-sútra* falls, in the first place, to be established; and, even if established, Vijnána would still require a fact or two more to help him fairly to his conclusion. It may be suspected that his sole foundation of fact, in the passage given at the outset of this note, is the common application of the term *Sánkhya* to the system called from Kapila and to that of the Yoga.

* For evidence that Aniruddha was antecedent to Vijnána Bhikshu, see the Appendix to this volume, pp. 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12.

† Mahádeva is likewise author of a Vedánta treatise, the *Tattwánusandhána*. See my Catalogue of Sanskrit Books, &c, Vol. I., p. 97. He has also written a commentary on the *Amara-kos'a*, entitled *Budha-manohara*. Of this work I have one copy of the first two books, and another of the second only. The latest authority, of ascertained date, quoted in this fragment, is Ráya Mukuṭa, who was employed on his commentary in the

VI. The *Rája-vártika,* said to have been composed by, or for, Raṇaranga Malla, sovereign of Dhárá.*

Such commentaries on the *Tattwa-samása* as have been procured, will now be named.

I. The *Sarvopakáriṇí,* by a nameless writer.

II. The *Sánkhya-sútra-vivaraṇa,* also by an anonymous author.

III. The *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká, Sánkhyálankára,* or *Sánkhya-sútra-prakshepiká*;† likewise of unknown paternity.

---

lectively, *S'rí-kás'í-rája-ságara.* I have seen at least twelve or fifteen works by its author, who composed largely in Hindí and Marahattí, no less than in Sanskrit.

* For this appropriation I am indebted to the learned Pandit Kás'ínátha S'ástrí Ashṭaputra, of the Benares College. The Pandit is by far too well acquainted with Bhoja Rájá's commentary on the *Yoga-sútra,* to have mistaken it for the *Rája-várlika* The latter treatise, he assures me, was in his possession several years, during which he constantly lectured on it to his pupils.

The only surviving extract from this work, generally known, is found in the couplets quoted, by Váchaspati Mis'ra, near the end of the *Sánkhya-kaumudí;* and in the *Sarvopakáriṇí.* They have been cited in the note at p. 27, supra

† This work was published and translated by Dr. J. R. Ballantyne, in 1850; pp. 65, 8vo. Its titles were, at that time, unascertained.

Dr Röer—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1851, p. 405—states that the author of the *Sánkhya-tattwa-vilása* imputes this work to A'suri; but he contests the credibility of this attribution, on the showing of the commentary itself. It does not positively appear, however, that the author of the *Sánkhya-tattwa-vilása* is speaking of the *Sánkhya-krama-dípiká.*

For Panchas'ikha as scholiast of the *Tattwa-samása,* see p. 12, supra, foot-note.

To revert once more to A'suri: since the first sheet of this preface was printed, a commentary on the *Shaḍ-dars'ana-samuchchaya* has been procured, in which occurs the only passage attributed to this sage, that has yet offered itself to view. It is as follows:

IV. The *Tattwa-yáthárthya-dípana*, by Bhává Gaṇes'a Díkshita,* son of Bhává Vis'wanátha Díkshita, and pupil of Vijnána Bhikshu.

V. An unnamed volume of annotations, by Kshemánanda,† son of Raghunandana Díkshita.

The *Sánkhya-káriká*, by I's'wara Kṛishṇa,‡ ranks, in Hindu estimation, and deservedly, foremost among the Sánkhya com-

---

विविक्तं दृक्परिणतौ बुद्धौ भोगोऽस्य कथ्यते।
प्रतिबिम्बोदयः च्छे यथा चन्द्रमसोऽम्भसि॥

The *Shaḍ-dars'ana-samuchchaya*, I now find, has, for its author, Hari-bhadra Súri The commentary on it, to which reference is here made, the *Shaḍ-dars'ana-vṛitti*, is by Cháritra Sinha Gaṇi, disciple of Mati-bhadra Gaṇi, disciple of Bháva-dharma Gaṇi, a scholastic successor of Jina-bhadra Súri, disciple of Jina-rája Súri.

Hari-bhadra Súri gives an account of the origin of the word *Sánkhya*, which, as being altogether novel, deserves to be produced. While acknowledging the connection of Kapila with the Sánkhya, he alleges that the followers of this doctrine receive their appellation from the first doctor of their school, Sankha or S'ankha. His words are: ाङ्ख्यमिति कापिलदर्शनम्। ादिपुरुषनिमित्तेयं सञ्ज्ञा। And, elsewhere: साङ्ख्य इति पुरुषनिमित्तेयं सञ्ज्ञा। सङ्ख इमे साङ् ाः। तालव्यो वा श ारः। शङ्खनामाऽऽदिपुरुषः।

* He has also commented on the *Yoga-sútra*, in the *Yogánus'ásana-sútra-vritti*. Another of his works is the *Prabodha-chandrodaya-chich-chandriká*, or scholia on the *Prabodha-chandrodaya* drama.

† Author, also, of the *Nava-yoga-kallola*, or *Nyáya-ratnákara*; a concise treatise explanatory of the Yoga Aphorisms. He describes himself as belonging to a Kányakubja family of Ishṭikápura,—our barbarized Etawah, I am told. The only copy I have inspected of Kshemánanda's notes on the *Tattwa-samása*, is imperfect in its latter half.

‡ The history of I's'wara Kṛishṇa is utterly unknown. Swapnes'wara, in the *Kaumudí-prabhá*, makes him one with Kálidása: ईश्वर ष्णनाम्ना कालिदासेन कृताः कारि ाः। These words are continuous with the extract given in a foot-note to p. 10, supra. The only two MSS. of the *Kaumudí-prabhá* that I have seen, are defective at the conclusion, where Swapnes'wara may, perhaps, have enlarged on the traditional identity which he reports.

II. The *Sánkhya-tattwa-kaumudí*, or *Sánkhya-kaumudí*; by Váchaspati Mis'ra,* pupil of Mártanḍa-tilaka Swámí.

Gauḍapáda's *Bháshya* on the *Sánkhya-káriká*, including the Memorial Verses, was published, by Professor Wilson, at Oxford, in 1837. Prefixed to the originals is the Professor's translation of the commentary, accompanying Colebrooke's version of the text.

* There seem to have been two learned Hindus of the name of Váchaspati Mis'ra. Of the lawyer so called, Colebrooke says: "No more than ten or twelve generations have passed since he flourished at *Semaul* in Tirhút." Digest of Hindu Law, &c., Preface, p. xix.: 8vo. ed. of 1801. The same writer, after speaking of Váchaspati Mis'ra, the author of the *Bhámatí-nibandha*, goes on to remark: "This is the same Váchaspati whose commentaries on the *Sánkhya-káriká* of I's'wara Chandra [Kṛishna], and on the text and gloss of Patanjali's *Yoga* and Gotama's *Nyáya*, were noticed in former essays. He is the author of other treatises on dialectics (*Nyáya*), and of one entitled *Tattwa-bindu*, on the *Púrva-mímánsá* as it is expounded by Bhaṭṭa. All his works, in every department, are held in high and deserved estimation." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 332-3. It hence appears as if Colebrooke recognised this Váchaspati as distinct from some other,—from the jurist, in all probability. This distinction seems, in truth, to be indisputable; and yet I am unable to pronounce on the precise date that should be assigned to Váchaspati the lawyer; and materials fail me to verify the decision as to his age, cited above from Colebrooke. In the *Dwaita-nirṇaya*, he mentions that he wrote that work at the instance of Jayá, consort of Bhairava Rájá, and mother of Purushottama; but he enters into no further particulars. In another of his tracts, however, the *Viváda-chintámaṇi*, he alleges that, with a view to composing it, he had consulted, with other works, the *Ratnákara*. Now, the *Ratnákara* is known to have been prepared under the superintendence of Chanḍes'wara, minister of Harasinha Deva, son of Bhaves'a, princes of Mithilá; and it specifies, as the time of its publication, the S'aka year 1236, or A. D. 1314. Beyond this point, Váchaspati the lawyer cannot, then, be carried into antiquity.

The elder Váchaspati Mis'ra is several times quoted in the *Sarva-dars'ana-sangraha* of Mádhava A'chárya; and his gloss on Vyása's *Yoga-bháshya*, as likewise his *Tattwa-kaumudí*, is there mentioned in conjunction with his name. According to Colebrooke,—Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 301,—

This treatise has, in turn, furnished occasion for several expositions. Such are:

"Mádhava flourished towards the middle of the fourteenth century." The "no more than ten or twelve generations which Colebrooke reckons back from 1796 to Váchaspati the jurist, would be exhausted, even if Indian life averaged so many as three descents and a half to a century, long before we reached the time of Mádhava A'chárya. Moreover, I have seen a copy of part of the *Bhámati-nibandha*, which was transcribed in the Samvat year 1428, or A. D. 1372,—a date irreconcilable with Colebrooke's computation.

Váchaspati, in the brief enumeration, at the close of the *Bhámatí-nibandha*, of his own compositions, eight in number, does not name, among them, a single one on jurisprudence. This list, as expanded in the *Vedánta-kalpataru*, embraces the following works: one on the Nyáya, the *Nyáya-vártika-tátparya-ṭíká*; one on the Sánkhya, the *Tattwa-kaumudí*; one on the Yoga, the *Tattwa-s'áradí*; one on the Mímánsá, the *Nyáya-kaṇiká*, a gloss on the *Vidhi-viveka*; one on Bhaṭṭa's exposition of the Mímánsá, the *Tattwa-bindu*; two on the Vedánta, the *Tattwa-samíkshá*, which is commentary on the *Brahma-siddhi*, and the *Bhámatí*.

Váchaspati does not profess to confine himself, in this catalogue, to his writings of a certain class. Neither have we any hint that he was an author by proxy. These works must, of themselves, have cost good part of a life of study; and it is scarcely probable that, had the philosopher also become famous as a legal authority, his twofold character would not be celebrated, to this day, among the learned of India.

Several of these works are no longer known to exist. There is some uncertainty whether *Tattwa-s'áradí* be another name for the *Pátanjala-sútra-bháshya-vyákhyá*, but it seems, from the *Vedánta-kalpataru*, to be so. Colebrooke is, perhaps, incautious in saying that Váchaspati "is the author of other treatises on dialectics," besides the *Nyáya-vártika-tátparya-ṭíká*.

Váchaspati, in the *Bhámatí-nibandha*, speaks of himself as living in the reign of one Nṛiga Rájá. Common fame makes him to have been a native of Tirhút; and his family name, Mis'ra, marks him as a native of Gangetic Hindusthán.

Colebrooke—Miscell. Essays, Vol. I, p. 233—seems to be of opinion that the title *Tattwa-kaumudí* is applied to Váchaspati's Sánkhya work only by comparatively recent abbreviation. But the concluding distich of the book

a. The *Tattwa-kaumudí-vyákhyá,* by Bháratí Yati, pupil of Bodháraṇya Yati.

b. The *Tattwárṇava,* or *Tattwámṛita-prakás'iní;* by Rághavánanda Saraswatí,* disciple of Adwayánanda or Adhwaryu Bhagavat-páda, disciple of Vis'wes'wara.

c. The *Kaumudí-prabhá,* by Swapnes'wara, son of Váhinís'a.†

d. The *Tattwa-chandra,* by Náráyaṇa Tírtha Yati,‡ pupil of Vásudeva Tírtha, and disciple of Ráma-govinda Tírtha.

e. The *Sánkhya-tattwa-vilása, Sánkhya-vṛitti-prakás'a,* or *Sánkhyártha-sankhyáyika;* by Raghunátha Tarkavágís'a Bhaṭṭácharya, son of S'iva-ráma Chakravartí, son of Chandravandya,

---

itself, if not spurious, contains the shorter form. It also occurs in the list of Váchaspati's works, as lately detailed; and in Mádhava A'chárya's *Sarva-dars'ana-sangraha.*

The *Sánkhya-kaumudí* was published in Calcutta, in the Samvat year 1905, or A. D. 1848: pp. 49, small 8vo.

* To a writer or writers of this or similar name, Hindu literature is beholden for a number of volumes on the Vedánta and Mímánsá. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., pp. 70, 92, 139, and Appendix.

Rághavánanda quotes Aniruddha, and was, consequently, posterior to him.

† Váhinís'a had a brother surnamed Vidyámvása; and this is the title of the father of Rudra Bhaṭṭácharya, the logician. A person called Swapnes'-wara has contributed a series of annotations on the Aphorisms of S'áṇḍilya, entitled *S'áṇḍilya-s'ata-sútrí-bháshya.*

* Of this work I have seen only a fragment of the beginning, going over Váchaspati's notes on the first eight *kárikás.*

For several other works by Náráyaṇa Tírtha Yati, see my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I, pp. 88, 107, and Appendix. Colebrooke says, "He was author likewise of a gloss on the *Yoga-s'ástra,* as appears from his own references to it." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p 233. This statement has been substantially verified. There occurs, in his *Sánkhya-chandriká,* a passage in which he speaks of his commentary on the *Yoga-sútra.*

At p. 67 of this volume there are three couplets, introduced as if original. Two of them are cited by Náráyana Tírtha Yati, who, therefore, perhaps came after Vijnána Bhikshu.

son of Kás'ínátha, son of Balabhadra, son of Sarvávanda Mis'ra. This is little more than a jejune epitome of the *Sánkhya-kaumudí,* with a preface briefly explaining the *Tattwa-samása,* which it repeats.

f. The *Sánkhya-tattwa-vibhákara.**

III. The *Sánkhya-chandriká,* by Náráyaṇa Tírtha Yati, author of the *Tattwa-chandra,* which has been spoken of above.

IV. The *Sánkhya-kaumudí,*† by Ráma-kṛishṇa Bhaṭṭácharya, who is said to borrow freely from the author of the work last named.

The *Sánkhya-sára-viveka,* or *Sánkhya-sára,*‡ by Vijnána Bhikshu, consists of an expansion of the *Sánkhya-káriká,* and an abridgement of the writer's own *Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya.*

---

* This work I know only from the 1st Vol., by Dr. Weber, of Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek. Berlin: 1853, p. 638. Dr. Weber is in doubt whether its author's name be, or be not, Vans'ídhara.

† Colebrooke's Miscell. Essays, Vol. I, p 234. This work I have not seen. Lassen—Gymnosophista; Pref., p. ix.—makes it possible that it bears the second title of *Sánkhya-sára.* Prof. Wilson leaves this point undiscussed. *Sánkhya-kárika,* Preface, p. vii.

Colebrooke calls Ráma-kṛishna "a learned, and not ancient, writer of Bengal." He may be identifiable with Ráma-kṛishna Bhaṭṭácharya Chakravartí, pupil of Raghunátha Bhaṭṭácharya S'iromani. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I, p. 51.

‡ In prose and verse; three chapters of the former, and six of the latter. The metrical portion consists of *kárikás;* and contains about 270 couplets, principally in the *anushtubh* measure. Colebrooke calls this work a "treatise on the attainment of beatitude in this life." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 231. Its scope is, however, rather wider; comprehending salvation in general, as the meed of Sánkhya perfection.

The Rev. William Ward adventured an English translation of this treatise, in his work on the Hindus; Vol. II, pp. 121—172: 8vo. ed. of 1822.

Immediately succeeding the invocation of the *Sánkhya-sára-viveka,* is the following passage:

साङ् ारिकया शाद्दा तत्त्वं विवेचितम् ।
साङ् सारविवे ऽता वि ानेन प्रपञ्च्यते ॥

The *Sánkhya-tattwa-pradípa*, by Kavirája Yati or Bhikshu,* pupil of Vaikuṇṭha, is a brief exposition of the Sánkhya system.

The *Sánkhyártha-tattwa-pradípiká*, by Bhatta Kes'ava, son of Sadánanda, son of Bhaṭṭa Kes'ava, is a treatise resembling the last.†

प्रायः संक्षिपता साङ्ख्यप्रक्रिया कारिकागणे ।
सा ततोऽत्र वर्ण्यते लेशात् तदनुक्तांशमात्रतः ॥

Mr Ward's version of these couplets runs thus: "The nature of spirit was examined by me briefly in the *Sánkhya-káriká*; according to my ability I now publish the *Sánkhya-sára-viveka*, in which I have collected the essence of the Sánkhya doctrines, which may all be found in the *kárikás*."

The obvious rendering is, however, very different. 'The *Sánkhya-káriká* has discussed the nature of spirit but meagrely: Vijnána, in the *Sánkhya-sára-viveka*, therefore dilates on it. *On the other hand*, the processes of the Sánkhya have, in the *káriká* collection, been, for the most part, enunciated: accordingly, they are here set forth sparingly—so far only as they are there left unnoticed.'

Mr. Ward's text was, clearly, the same as my own, with the exception of a first case, in the second verse, instead of a seventh.

* Author of the *Tattwa-dípa* also. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., p. 109.

† Colebrooke speaks of a Sánkhya work entitled *Sangraha*. I do not recall having met, in the course of my researches, with any reference to it. See Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 234.

Ráya Mukuṭa, annotating the word *upalabdhi*, in his gloss on the *Amara-kos'a*, apparently quotes from a work called *Sánkhya-dars'ana*.

The *Sánkhya-muktávalí*, by Voḍhu, is, further, a Sánkhya work possibly now, or once, in existence; if the bare word of a man who has declared to me that he once possessed and studied a copy of it, is to be received. But I strongly suspect that he fabricated the title of the treatise, for the occasion.

The Rev. Mr. Ward has published a list of Sánkhya compositions, in his work on the Hindus; Vol. II., p. 121: 8vo. ed. of 1822. This list is, however, one mass of errors, and errors almost too gross to deserve advertence. It assigns the *Kapila-bháshya* to Vis'wes'warí, perhaps instead of Vijnánes'wara, as one sometimes hears Vijnána Bhikshu incorrectly called; while it speaks of the *Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya* as a distinct composition, and neglects to name its author. Váchaspati Mís'ra's *Sánkhya-kaumudí* is, in like manner, duplicated. This for a sample.

Of the history of our com entator, Vijnána Bhikshu, or Vijnána Yati, little has been discovered. We are even unacquainted with the civil appellation that he bore previously to commencing cenobite; and the period at which he flourished, if not wholly referrible to conjecture, can be determined only by approximation. He must have preceded Náges'a Bhaṭṭa, the epitomist of one of his works, who may have been living in the year 1713.* Three of his disciples† are known by name: Bhává Gaṇes'a Díkshita,‡ Prasáda Mádhava Yogí,§ and Divya

---

The ignorance of our pandits very ordinarily confounds Vijnána Bhikshu with Vijnánes'wara, or Vijnána Yogí, author of the *Mitákshará*, the celebrated commentary on the *Yájnavalkya-smriti*. But there is no evidence whatever that they are identical. Vijnánes'wara, who bore the title of Bhaṭṭáraka, was son of Padmanábha Bhaṭṭa, of the stock of Bharadwája. His preceptor was Vis'warúpa A'chárya, likewise a scholiast of Yájnavalkya. I shall not undertake to establish that this Vis'warúpa A'chárya was the same person as Sures'wara A'chárya, secularly known as Maṇḍana Mis'ra, a disciple of S'ankara A'chárya. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., pp. 89, 91, 131.

* See a foot-note to p. 32, supra. In the prefatory verses of Vijnána's *Pátanjala-bháshya-vártika*, according to one of the many MSS. of it which I have examined, allusion is made to one Bhavadeva, as an authority on the Yoga. Bhavadeva Mis'ra of Patna, author of the *Pátanjalíyábhinava-bháshya*, a commentary on the *Yoga-sútra*, seems to be intended. But of his age I know nothing.

† M. Saint-Hilaire says: "Un maître n'a généralement qu'un disciple; un gorou n' a qu'un brahmatchâri." Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, p. 7. Again: "La science, ainsi que j'ai eu occasion de le dire au début de ce mémoire, se transmet, dans l'Inde, habituellement d'un seul maître à un seul disciple" Ibid., p. 254. This is news in India. Such unnatural cases no longer exist, if, indeed, they ever existed.

‡ I have seen a MS., without date, of the *Tantra-chúḍámaṇi* or *Dharma-ímánsá-sangraha*, an elementary Mímánsá disquisition, by Krishna Deva, son of Ráma A'chárya, which professes to be in the hand-writing of this person. I hardly incline to consider the age of this MS. to be a couple of centuries, at the most.

§ Author of the *S'áríra-káriká-bháshya* or *Kárikártha-cinis'chaya*, a dis-

Sinha Mis'ra.* Vijnána is the author of at least five several works, all of which are concerned with philosophy. Their titles, in the order, mainly, in which they were composed,† are as follows: the *Vijnánámrita* or *Brahma-sútra-riju-vyákhyá*,‡ the *Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya* or *Sánkhya-bháshya*,§ the *Pátanjala-bháshya-vártika* or *Yoga-vártika*,‖ the *Sánkhya-sára-viveka* or *Sánkhya-sára*, and the *Yoga-sára-sangraha* or *Jnána-pradípa*.¶

I have not proposed, in this preface, to treat of the Sánkhya system otherwise than with reference to the subordinate subjects of biography and bibliography. A number of obvious occasions have, however, emerged for deviating from these rigid bounds. Yet, for thus trespassing beyond my limits, no apology may, perhaps, be expected; and none, certainly, will be requisite for a few sentences in defence of my proper charge, Vijnána Bhikshu.

---

sertation on the following enigmatical couplet, which its expounder claims to derive from the *Mahábhárata*:

एकया द्वे विनिश्चित्य त्रींश्चतुर्भिर्वशीकुरु ।
पञ्च जित्वा विदित्वा षट् सप्त हित्वा सुखी भव ॥

This dissertation is in four sections, one being allotted to each measure of the distich.

* Divya Sinha Mis'ra has written a commentary, by name *S'áríra-káriká-bháshya-vártika*, on the work mentioned in the last note. He styles himself *fellow-student* of Prasáda Mádhava Yogí, under Vijnána Bhikshu; and he eulogizes Prasáda Mádhava as the most eminent of their master's disciples.

† Each of these works, from the last upwards, cites all that, as here disposed, precede it. But the *Sánkhya-bháshya* and the *Yoga-vártika* quote each other. Their author appears, accordingly, to have been engaged with both at the same time; unless he, or some one else, interpolated one or the other.

‡ A commentary on Bádaráyana's Aphorisms of the Vedánta; containing 7[illegible] *s'lokas*.

§ Embracing *s'l.* 3400.

‖ A commentary on the *Pátanjala-bháshya* of Vyása: *s'l.* 6300.

¶ A succinct exposition of the Yoga philosophy: *s'l.* 830 circiter.

In India, at least, Vijnána Bhikshu's ability as an expositor of the Sánkhya philosophy stands unimpeached. It has, however, at last been disallowed by so considerable a scholar as M. Saint-Hilaire. But it will be easy to evince, after the ensuing extract, whether our scholiast's judgement, particularly as regards the specific point on which the European philosopher arraigns it, be as immature as has been represented.

M. Saint-Hilaire translates and descants on the twenty-fifth of I's'wara Krishna's memorial stanzas, as follows:

" VINGT-CINQUIÈME SLOKA DE LA KARIKA.

" ' L'ensemble des onze principes doués de bonté émane du moi quand il est modifié également par la bonté. Du moi considéré comme élément primitif viennent les éléments grossiers; il est alors obscur; et cette double émanation n'a lieu que par l'influence de l'activité.'

" Lorsque dans le moi la bonté l'emporte sur l'obscurité et sur la méchanceté ou passion, le moi est essentiellement pur; et, dans le langage des anciens maîtres, le moi, à cet état, est appelé modifié. Sa véritable nature, c'est d'être affecté par la bonté; et quand il est ainsi affecté, la modification qu'il reçoit est celle qu'il doit véritablement recevoir; ce n'est pas en quelque sorte une modification pour lui, puisque son essence c'est d'être bon. C'est du moi dans cette disposition que sortent les onze principes, doués alors comme lui de bonté. On se rappelle que les onze principes sont les cinq organes de perception, les cinq organes d'action, et le manas, ou le coeur, placé au onzième rang. Quand au contraire le moi est affecté d'obscurité, on ne l'appelle plus Veikrita, le modifié; mais on l'appelle Bhoûtâdi, l'élément primitif, l'obscur; et c'est de lui que sortent les cinq éléments grossiers, les Bhoutâni. Mais pour produire l'une ou l'autre de ces créations, soit les onze organes doués de bonté, soit les cinq éléments grossiers, le moi a besoin de l'intervention de l'activité.* Par lui-même le moi

---

* The three *guṇas* are, it may be, still an unread riddle; and I decline the attempt of improving on the interpretations of them that have been ventured by my predecessors.

Prof. Wilson formerly wrote of them as follows: " The Hindu system arranges all the attributes of spirit in action, under three heads or qualities; the *sattwa, rajas,* and *tamas*. The first comprises the presence of all good, and absence of all evil; the last, the presence of all evil, and the absence of all good; and the middle one is a mixed quality, in which the operation

In India, at least, Vijnána Bhikshu's ability as an expositor of the Sánkhya philosophy stands unimpeached. It has, however, at last been disallowed by so considerable a scholar as M. Saint-Hilaire. But it will be easy to evince, after the ensuing extract, whether our scholiast's judgement, particularly as regards the specific point on which the European philosopher arraigns it, be as immature as has been represented.

M. Saint-Hilaire translates and descants on the twenty-fifth of I's'wara Krishṇa's memorial stanzas, as follows:

"VINGT-CINQUIÈME SLOKA DE LA KARIKA.

"'L'ensemble des onze principes doués de bonté émane du moi quand il est modifié également par la bonté. Du moi considéré comme élément primitif viennent les éléments grossiers; il est alors obscur; et cette double émanation n'a lieu que par l'influence de l'activité.'

"Lorsque dans le moi la bonté l'emporte sur l'obscurité et sur la méchanceté ou passion, le moi est essentiellement pur; et, dans le langage des anciens maîtres, le moi, à cet état, est appelé modifié. Sa véritable nature, c'est d'être affecté par la bonté, et quand il est ainsi affecté, la modification qu'il reçoit est celle qu'il doit véritablement recevoir; ce n'est pas en quelque sorte une modification pour lui, puisque son essence c'est d'être bon. C'est du moi dans cette disposition que sortent les onze principes, doués alors comme lui de bonté. On se rappelle que les onze principes sont les cinq organes de perception, les cinq organes d'action, et le manas, ou le cœur, placé au onzième rang. Quand au contraire le moi est affecté d'obscurité, on ne l'appelle plus Vaikrita, le modifié; mais on l'appelle Bhoûtâdi, l'élément primitif, l'obscur; et c'est de lui que sortent les cinq éléments grossiers, les Bhoutâni. Mais pour produire l'une ou l'autre de ces créations, soit les onze organes doués de bonté, soit les cinq éléments grossiers, le moi a besoin de l'intervention de l'activité.* Par lui-même le moi

---

* The three *guṇas* are, it may be, still an unread riddle; and I decline the attempt of improving on the interpretations of them that have been ventured by my predecessors.

Prof. Wilson formerly wrote of them as follows. "The Hindu system arranges all the attributes of spirit in action, under three heads or qualities; the *sattwa*, *rajas*, and *tamas*. The first comprises the presence of all good, and absence of all evil, the last, the presence of all evil, and the absence of all good; and the middle one is a mixed quality, in which the operation

est inerte : dans son état de pureté, il n'agit pas ; il faut pour agir qu'il appelle à son aide un autre moi, qui est le moi actif ; et, par l'union de ces deux moi, se trouvent produits et les onze organes et les cinq éléments grossiers.

" Le moi a donc quatre états successifs, et comme quatre phases par lesquelles il passe pour arriver à la création. D'abord il est inerte et ne produit rien ; puis il devient actif sous l'influence de la passion ; ensuite il produit les onze organes, et pour les produire il est doué de bonté ; enfin, doué d'obscurité, il produit les cinq éléments grossiers.

" Cette évolution du moi peut paraître aussi bizarre que fausse ; mais la pensée, quelle qu'en soit d'ailleurs la valeur, est fort claire ; et le commentateur Gaoudapada n'hésite pas à l'expliquer comme on vient de le faire. Il entend le sloka de la Kârikâ en ce sens que c'est le moi qui donne naissance aux onze organes d'une part, et d'autre part aux cinq éléments grossiers. Mais Vidjnâna Bhikshou, le commentateur des Soûtras, entend tout

---

of the affections and passions is strongest, and gives occasional predominance to good and ill." Quarterly Oriental Magazine for March, 18[illegible]; p. 21. In the next page he adds : " S'ridhara and Nilakantha, it is true, interpret *sattwa* by *dhairya*, firmness, fortitudo : but they intend the same thing, in fact, with the *sattwa* quality, or the Mens Solida of the upright man who is unmoved by ignorance and passion. It appears to be the same as the Temperantia or Tranquillitas of the Stoics, whilst the *rajas* might be expressed by Perturbatio, and *tamas* by Intemperantia."

Mr. J. Ellis unhesitatingly renders the names of the qualities by " pure unimpassioned virtue," " passion," and " depravity inclining to evil ;" and he believes the apocryphal Sanchoniathon to have had some inkling of these technicalities, and to have bungled them in his mystical theogony. Notice of the *Rámáya*, of Bodháyana, in the Quarterly Oriental Magazine for September, 1826 ; pp. 8, 15, and 16.

M. Saint-Hilaire says : " Je crois qu'en résumé cette attribution des trois qualités à la nature cache une idée des plus simples : elle signifie uniquement que les choses dans leur rapports avec nous, car c'est à l'homme que tout se rapporte dans ce système d'idéalisme, ne peuvent être que de trois sortes, bonnes, mauvaises, ou indifférentes. J'ai vainement cherché un autre sens aux théories du Sânkhya ; je ne puis leur trouver que celui-là. Dans les nombreux passages des commentateurs, des poemes et des pourânas où il est question des trois qualités, elles se présentent toujours sous cet aspect." Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, p. 317.

autrement la pensée de Kapila. Je viens de dire que le Soût du sûtre est ici complétement identique, sauf un neutre en place d'un masculin, au vers de la Kârikâ. Ainsi les deux commentateurs ont le même texte, et la différence d'interprétation ne repose pas sur une différence de mots. Or Vidjnâna comprend qu'il s'agit ici, non pas de l'ensemble des onze principes sortant du moi, mais du onzième principe, c'est-à-dire du manas, du cœur, qui, dans toutes les classifications, figure régulièrement, comme on l'a vu, au onzième rang, parce qu'il est tout à la fois organe de perception et organe d'action. Il faudrait donc faire ici un changement considérable, et substituer le manas aux onze organes. Je dois dire que la grammaire ne s'y oppose en rien, et que le texte, soit avec le neutre de Kapila, soit avec le masculin d'Isvara Krishna, se prête également bien à l'un et à l'autre [illegible].

"Si l'on adopte l'explication de Vidjnâna, il faudrait traduire le vingt-cinquième sloka de la façon suivante:

"'Le onzième principe doué de bonté émane du moi quand le moi est modifié également par la bonté; du onzième principe, considéré comme élément primitif, viennent les éléments grossiers. Ce onzième principe est obscur; et tous deux, ce principe et le moi, n'agissent que sous l'influence de l'activité.'

"Mais on peut remarquer que cette explication est en contradiction formelle avec les slokas qui précèdent: d'abord avec le sloka vingt-deuxième, qui fait sortir directement du moi les seize principes, et qui fait sortir en particulier les éléments grossiers des éléments subtils; et ensuite, avec le sloka vingt-quatrième, qui reproduit la même doctrine. Il faut ajouter que cette doctrine que nous retrouvons dans la Kârikâ vient de Kapila lui-même, comme le prouve le soûtra que nous avons cité. Nous devons donc nous en fier à l'explication de Gaoudapada plutôt qu'à celle de Vidjnâna. Dans le système sânkhya bien interprété, les cinq éléments grossiers viennent des cinq éléments subtils; et les cinq éléments subtils avec les onze organes viennent du moi. Ce n'est pas le manas, le cœur, qui produit les éléments grossiers, comme le croit Vidjnâna Bhikshou; et ce qui doit nous étonner encore davantage dans son erreur, c'est que, dans le soûtra immédiatement précédent, Kapila dit expressément, lecture deuxième, soûtra [illegible]: 'L'effet du moi, c'est l'ensemble des onze organes et des cinq éléments grossiers.' Quelque délicat qu'il soit de se prononcer dans des questions de ce genre, nous croyons pouvoir affirmer que Vidjnâna Bhikshou s'est trompé, et qu'il n'y a point à tenir compte de son opinion." Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, pp. 99—102.

M. Saint-Hilaire's rendering of the memorial couplet calls, first of all, for attention.

In the preceding extract we read that it is of the essence of egotism to be good. Yet it is no more so than it is of its es-

---

produced from egotism only by the intermediate agency of the elementary particles.

The mistake which Professor Wilson falls into, after his attempt to correct Colebrooke, can easily enough be accounted for. Gandapáda says: भूतानामादिभूतः । तमोच बहुलोक्तः स तामस इति । Thus the Professor translates thus: "The first element of the elements is darkness; therefore it is usually called *the dark*." But the word here rendered by "first element" would, as masculine, mean 'first being,' if it were a substantive; 'first element' requiring, not *ádibhútah*, but *ádibhútam*. Being, however, an adjective, it refers to *bhútádi*, the second factor of which it justifies etymologically. This reference should have been evident from the gender of *uktah*, *sa*, and *támasa*; and also from that of *bahulas*, which, with its present ending, and, moreover, as it stands in the sentence, could never be an adverb. It is not propounded that the elements originate from their like, from an element; and, while nothing is predicated of darkness, darkness is predicated as characterizing one of the varieties of egotism. The passage cited above will, therefore, admit of no other translation than such as this: 'It, *origin of the elements*, is originary, *viz.*, of the elements: *it is also* surcharged with darkness; *and* hence is called dark.' To bear out Professor Wilson's English, the Sanskrit should have stood thus: भूतानामादिभूतं तमः । तेन च बहुलं तत् तामसमिति ।

In giving the passage from Gaudapáda, I have supplied it with punctuation, and the only punctuation that it will abide.

In the *Vishṇu-puráṇa*, at I, 12, 53, the term *bhútádi* 'generative of the elements,' epithetically employed in place of 'dark egotism,' is again rendered, by Professor Wilson, "first element." See his Translation, p. 93, line 12.

Professor Wilson, building on his oversight, indulges in the following comment, which may now be cancelled: "There is a remarkable expression in the *Bháshya*, which presents a notion familiar to all ancient cosmogonies. Gaudapáda says, 'the first of the elements was darkness.' It is the first of the 'elements,' not the first of 'things;' for it was preceded by unevolved nature, and intellect, and it is itself a modified form of individuality. It therefore harmonizes perfectly well with the prevailing ideas in the ancient world, of the state of things anterior to elementary or visible creation, when 'chaos was, and night,' and when

sence to be dark, or to be active. To the end that egotism may acquire the distinction of pure, it is not necessary that it should

---

Nullus adhuc mundo praebebat lumina Titan,
Nec nova crescendo reparabat cornua Phœbe.

In the influence of the quality of foulness, or passion,—for the word *rajas* has both senses,—may be suspected an affinity to the doctrine of an active principle, the moving mind, the *eros*, that set inert matter into motion, and produced created things." *Sánkhya-káriká*, p. 94.

Lassen, who was the first to translate the whole of Is'wara Krishna's treatise, had a right understanding of *bhútádi*. "Caterva undenum essentialis proficiscitur e sui sensu essentiali; rudimentalis ex (sui sensu) elementorum generatore; haec caliginosa est. Ex impetuoso (sui sensu) utralibet oritur creatio." Twenty-fifth *káriká*, in Gymnosophista, p 58.

C. J. H. Windischmann prudently follows Lassen; putting "Anfang der Elemente" for *bhútádi*. Die Philosophie im Fortgang der Weltgeschichte, p. 1816.

A revised version of the *káriká* in question is here submitted: "The class of eleven, consisting of purity, proceeds from egotism *technically called* modified. From *egotism, as* the source of the elements, the rudimental particles *originate; and* this *form of egotism is* imbued with darkness. *But it is only* from *egotism when* affected by activity *that* the one and the other, *the class of eleven and the elementary particles, take their rise*"

It may be observed that, while Professor Wilson, at p. 94 of the *Sánkhya-káriká*, considers egotism, in one of its kinds, as "the first of the elements," at p. 121 he places, by the side of the *tan-mátras* 'subtile elements,'—which emanate from egotism, and give birth to the gross elements,—as speciously comparable, the στοιχεῖα στοιχείων of Empedocles. For the seeming parallel to these elemental ultimates, the Professor ought, in consistency, to have gone back to dark egotism. But it has previously been shown that the Sánkhya does not recognise as elementary anything antecedent to the particles so designated.

The Professor's remarks, incidentally bearing on the functions of *bhútádi*, at p. 164 of the *Sánkhya-káriká*, are unsubstantiated. The text on which these mistaken observations are founded, is as follows: एवमभौतिकः सर्गो लिङ्गसर्गो भावसर्गो भूतसर्गो दैवमानुषतैर्यग्योना इत्येष प्रधानतः षोडशसर्गः। "Thus, non-elemental creation, rudimental creation, conditional and elemental creation, in beings of divine, mortal, brutal, and (immovable) origin, are the sixteen sorts of creation effected by nature." Such is Professor

consist wholly of purity; the mere preponderance of this qua-

---

Wilson's translation; instead of which we should certainly read: 'The non-elemental creation,—*i. e.*, the rudimental creation and the conditional creation,—and the elemental creation, *or the aggregate of* beings of divine, mortal, and brutal, origin, are the sixteen sorts of creation proceeding *mediately* from nature.'

My MS. wants the word भूतसर्गा 'elemental creation;' but its insertion, as an equivalent of the भौतिकः सर्गः of the 53d *káriká*, is quite immaterial. Moreover, I have corrected a grammatical inadvertence.

The elemental creation has fourteen divisions; and the two branches of the non-elemental count, each, as unity. The sum of sixteen is thus completed. There is, then, no such respective reference, in the above passage, as may have led the Professor to supply the word 'immovable,' and which induced him to make the following comment: "Apparently, each of the four classes of beings proceeds from four modifications of nature, or, from the invisible principles, from the subtile rudiments, from the conditions or dispositions of intellect, and from the gross elements."

The evolution of the Sánkhya principles as recited in the *Vishnu-purána*, is strangely misrepresented by the translator. A single sample will suffice.

भूतादिस्तु विकुर्वाणः शब्दतन्मात्रिकं ततः ॥
ससर्ज शब्दतन्मात्रादाकाशं शब्दलक्षणम् ।
शब्दमात्रं तथाऽऽकाशं भूतादिः स समावृणोत् ॥

I., 2, 37-8.

"Elementary Egotism then becoming productive, as the rudiment of sound, produced from it Ether, of which sound is the characteristic, investing it with its rudiment of sound" Translation, p. 16.

The correct rendering is, however: 'The element-engendering *egotism*, being modified, then produced the rudiment of sound; *and*, from the rudiment of sound, the ether, whose characteristic is sound: *and* this element-engendering *egotism*, similarly *to agents in processes before mentioned*, invested the ether, which consists of sound.'

Almost the entire page from which the passage above animadverted on is taken, is disfigured by the style of misapprehension just pointed out. In one place, in fact, in order to force the construction desired, the nominative singular *váyú*—euphonically required for *váyuh*—is made accusative. Saintly liberties vastly more licentious than this, are often taken, in the Puráṇas, but there is, in this instance, no temptation whatever to do violence to Páṇini.

lity being held sufficient for the purpose.* Further, the term *manas* is said to mean 'heart.' At p. 30, it is called "l'esprit vital." At p. 106, a choice is allowed out of "le cœur," "l'esprit," and, "pour prendre une expression plus juste et assez souvent employée dans notre langage philosophique, le *sensorium commune*."† The *manas* is defined, by Sánkhya authorities, to be one of the soul's three internal organs, without which there is no experience of joy or grief; in the same way as, for instance, but for the eye, one of the soul's external organs, sight is impossible.

In order to adjust the twenty-fifth *káriká* after Vijnána's conception of *manas*, M. Saint-Hilaire correctly premises that this word must be substituted, in the couplet, for the eleven organs. But, professing to effect this substitution, while he once puts *manas* for the eleven organs, he puts it three times for egotism. He also puts egotism for subtile elements, or, rather, gross elements; for he foists this blunder of his own, as well as his borrowed primitive element, on the injured commentator. Again, purposing to censure Vijnána, he remarks rightly, at first, that, 'in the Sánkhya system, accurately expounded, the five gross elements issue from the five subtile elements; and the five subtile elements, and the eleven organs, from egotism.' Yet, in

* Indeed, in the twenty-fifth *káriká* itself we have the word *vikrita* 'modified' as a synonyme of *sáttwika* 'pure.' Elsewhere, *vaikárika* 'modificational' occurs as its substitutes.

† Professor Wilson had already explained *manas* to be "an internal sense, a *sensorium*." *Sánkhya-káriká*, p. 100. Colebrooke calls it a "sensitive, material organ," and likens it to the θυμὸς of Pythagoras. Miscell Essays, Vol. I., p. 418.

The word *manas* has often been compared to the Greek μένος; but, whether as used in the Sánkhya system, or elsewhere, it bears very little similarity to this term, which "seems most commonly to answer to the Latin word *impetus*, and implies rather a physical, than mental, energy. Homer places it, at different times, in the knees, the θύμος, the στῆθος, and the φρήν." Mitchell's Wasps of Aristophanes, p. 103.

translating and annotating the twenty-fifth *káriká,* we have seen that it is the gross elements which he derives immediately from egotism.

But Vijnána has clearly enough set forth his view of the twenty-fifth *káriká,* as M. Saint-Hilaire would have seen, had he read, even with the aid of Professor Wilson, the scholiast's interpretation of the eighteenth Aphorism of the second Book.* After alleging *manas* to mean the eleventh organ, Vijnána explains 'both' to refer to the intellectual organs and the organs of action. The *káriká* will, then, run thus: 'The eleventh *organ,* consisting of purity, originates from modified egotism. From *egotism, as* the source of the elements, *proceed* the rudimental particles; *and* this *variety of egotism is* imbued with darkness. From *egotism* affected by activity, arise both *the intellectual organs and the organs of action.*'

Vijnána is, therefore, peculiar, as compared with some others, in deducing, from pure egotism, but a single product, mind, instead of eleven, viz., mind and the ten organs of intellection and action: the latter being referred, by him, to the active species of egotism; which is held, on the adverse interpretation, to be, independently, inoperative, but yet an indispensable condition of energy on the part of the other two modifications of the self-conscious principle. To defend, textually, his exegesis of the latter part of the twenty-fifth *káriká,* Vijnána must be supposed to contemplate the twenty-sixth *káriká;* inasmuch as the organs of understanding and action are there mentioned for the first time in the treatise: and this anticipation is clearly impracticable, save by the dislocation of all syntax. Nevertheless, the import which Vijnána contends for, is far from being a peculiarity

* *Sánkhya-káriká,* p. 94. Professor Wilson here, too, however, requires to be set right. Forgetting the order in which he has just enumerated the modifications of egotism, he writes "the other ten, from the second kind; and the elements, from the third." The words 'second' and 'third' must be transposed.

personal to himself only. Both the sets of Aphorisms attributed to Kapila are silent on the topic under discussion; and so is the *Mahábhárata.* Arguing, however, from the Hindu point of view,—such as it is,—our commentator is supported by the divine testimony of the Puráṇas, against the mere human authority of I's'wara Kṛishṇa and his successors.* At all events, the ex-

---

* The productiveness of active egotism is the doctrine of the Puránas. The *Mahábhárata,* after XII., 11395, where it would be expected to propound either this view, or else one that would preclude it, is suggestively mute. Can it be that this tenet is a developement dating subsequently to I's'wara Krishṇa's time; having been, since then, grafted on the Puráṇas? I quote, below, from these works.

भूततन्मात्रसर्गोऽयमहङ्कारात् तु तामसात् ।
तै सान्यैन्द्रियाण्या र्देवा वैकारिका दश ॥
एकादशं मनश्चात्र देवा वैकारिकाः स्मृताः ।

Vishṇu-puráṇa, I., 1, 46-7.

" This is the elemental creation, proceeding from the principle of egotism affected by the property of darkness. The organs of sense are said to be the passionate products of the same principle, affected by foulness; and the ten divinities proceed from egotism affected by the principle of goodness; as does mind, which is the eleventh." Prof. Wilson's Translation, pp. 17, 18

In a foot-note to p. 16, Prof. Wilson repeats Gauḍapáda's account of the three sorts of egotism, but without directing attention to its contradiction of his text.

For a passage to the same effect with the verses given above, see the *Bhágavata puráṇa,* III., 5, 29 seqq.: also III, 26, 27 seqq. It is the first of these two passages that is cited, by Vijnána, at p. 118. Vírarághava, in his commentary, the *Bhágavata-chandriká,* wrests the word *taijasát,* in the fourth verse, into congruity with the dogmas of I's'wara Krishna and his school, by explaining it to denote 'with the aid of passional *egotism.*'

Add: वैकारिकादहङ्कारात् सर्गो वैकारिकोऽभवत् ।
तै सानीन्द्रियाणि स्युर्देवा वैकारिका दश ॥
एकादशं मनस्तत्र स्वगुणेनोभया कम् ।
भूतत न्त्रसर्गोऽयं भूतादेरभवन् प्र ाः ॥

Kúrma-puráṇa, prior section, 4th chapter.

pression of amazement ventured by M. Saint-Hilaire, is altogether gratuitous; and it would have been well had he foregone the temerity of impeaching, with headlong disparagement, the adjudication, by so acute and learned a writer as Vijnána, of a nice philosophical punctuality. Vijnána, so far from the preposterous solecism of deducing any of the elements from mind, expands the seventeenth Aphorism of the second Book in these words: 'The eleven organs, and the five subtile elements, *i. e.*, sound, &c., are the products of egotism.'* Gross from subtile

---

Pure egotism, here, again, is made to generate the ten superintending deities, who, according to the Sankhya system as ordinarily enunciated, except in the Puránas, must form part of the world of animation, which emanates from the subtile elements. The names of these deities occur in the *Bhágavata-puráṇa*, II., 5, 30. M. Burnouf, in his translation of this work, Vol. I., p. 122, renders the appellation of one of them, Dis', by "les points cardinaux." The directions are variously computed, by the Hindus, at four, eight, and ten. Professor Wilson arbitrarily expresses Dis' by "space." *Vishnu-puráṇa*, p. 17, 28th foot-note.

An eleventh deity is recognised by some of the Puráṇas,—the moon, whose presidency is over mind.

In the verses quoted above, from the *Kúrma-puráṇa*, mind is strangely said to partake of the two qualities of activity and purity.

The *Sarva-dars'ana-sangraha* considers the ten organs and mind to be effluences from pure egotism, and silently ignores any hypothesis of their originating otherwise.

It is a curious circumstance that this work nowhere mentions the Sánkhya Aphorisms; its authority on hylotheistic matters, wherever a text is to be cited, being the *Káriká* of I's'wara Krishna.

An examination of S'ankara Achárya's *Sarva-siddhánta-sangraha*, which I have not been able to procure, would, very probably, throw light on the Sánkhya as received in the eighth century. The ninth chapter of this treatise is occupied with the doctrine of Kapila. See Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, Vol. I., p 200.

* See, at p. 45, supra, M. Saint-Hilaire's incorrect translation of the passage which I render thus. The essayist's heedlessness is, here, unaccountable.

follows of necessity.* As to the rest, his predilections, alike in the present instance and elsewhere, are for the doctrines of the original Sentences, as altered and amplified by Pauráṇika innovation.

The Sánkhya system assumes, in practice, the form of the adoration of nature,† or, rather, of a sublimated ideal essence of

---

* In the Sánkhya Aphorisms, the coordinate emanation, from the subtile elements, of the gross elements, is expressly indicated as early as I., 61,—which M. Saint-Hilaire passes by, as has previously been shown:—and Vijnána, in his notes, is nowise eccentric in his paraphrase of this text.

† *Múla-prakṛiti*, the primordial agent, whose analogues, in the several Hindu schools of philosophy, are too notorious to call for repetition. The late Rev. Dr. W. H. Mill has likened it to the ἔννοια of Gnosticism, "in which, as in the Sánkhya, νοῦς, or intellect, *buddhi*,—otherwise called *mahat*,—is the first-born offspring; and then all separate individual essences." Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1835, p. 386. Such was the dream of Valentine, as we learn from Irenæus: Λέγουσι γάρ τινα εἶναι ἐν ἀοράτοις καὶ ἀκατονομάστοις ὑψώμασι τέλειον Αἰῶνα προόντα· τοῦτον δὲ καὶ * * * * * Προπάτορα καὶ Βυθὸν καλοῦσιν. * * * * * Ὑπάρχοντα δ' αὐτὸν ἀχώρητον καὶ ἀόρατον, ἀΐδιόν τε καὶ ἀγέννητον ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ καὶ ἠρεμίᾳ πολλῇ γεγονέναι ἐν ἀπείροις αἰῶσι χρόνων. Συνυπάρχειν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ Ἔννοιαν, ἣν δὴ καὶ Χάριν καὶ Σιγὴν ὀνομάζουσι. Καὶ ἐννοηθῆναί ποτε ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ προβαλέσθαι τὸν Βυθὸν τοῦτον ἀρχὴν τῶν πάντων, καὶ καθάπερ σπέρμα τὴν προβολὴν ταύτην (ἣν προβαλέσθαι ἐνενοήθη) καὶ καταθέσθαι, ὡς ἐν μήτρᾳ, τῇ συνυπαρχούσῃ ἑαυτῷ Σιγῇ. Ταύτην δὲ ὑποδεξαμένην τὸ σπέρμα τοῦτο καὶ ἐγκύμονα γενομένην ἀποκυῆσαι Νοῦν ὅμοιόν τε καὶ ἴσον τῷ προβαλόντι καὶ μόνον χωροῦντα τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ Πατρός. Τὸν δὲ Νοῦν τοῦτον καὶ Μονογενῆ καλοῦσι, Πατέρα καὶ Ἀρχὴν τῶν πάντων. Συμπροβεβλῆσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ Ἀλήθειαν. Καὶ εἶναι ταύτην πρώτην καὶ ἀρχέγονον Πυθαγορικὴν Τετρακτὺν, ἣν καὶ ῥίζαν τῶν πάντων καλοῦσιν. Ἔστι γὰρ Βυθὸς καὶ Σιγὴ, ἔπειτα Νοῦς καὶ Ἀλήθεια. Irenæi Opera, ed. Stieren: Lipsiae, 1853: Tom I., pp. 10 seqq. Cyril, of Jerusalem, gives Valentine's genealogy of the Aeons very differently: Ὁ Βυθὸς ἐγέννησε Σιγὴν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Σιγῆς ἐτεκνοποίει Λόγον, κ. τ. λ. Catech. VI.

In the Refutation of all Heresies, by Hippolytus, Irenæus's disciple, it is shown, however, that Simon, the Samaritan sorcerer, a precursor

the material world, for which the European languages, nowise to their discredit, want a name. That this scheme of speculation

---

of Valentine, had quite a different cosmogony,—and not in nomenclature only: Δύο εἰσὶ παραφυάδες τῶν ὅλων αἰώνων, μήτε ἀρχὴν μήτε πέρας ἔχουσαι, ἀπὸ μιᾶς ῥίζης, ἥτις ἐστὶ δύναμις, Σιγὴ, ἀόρατος, ἀκατάληπτος, ὧν ἡ μία φαίνεται ἄνωθεν, ἥτις ἐστὶ μεγάλη δύναμις, Νοῦς τῶν ὅλων, διέπων τὰ πάντα, ἄρσην. Ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα, κάτωθεν, Ἐπίνοια μεγάλη, θήλεια, γεννῶσα τὰ πάντα. Simon's Ἀπόφασις Μεγάλη. Vide Origenis [*lege* Hippolyti] Philosophumena, sive Omnium Hæresium Refutatio, ed. Emmanuel Miller; p. 173. Though Gregory of Nazianzus—supported by his commentators, Elias of Crete and Nicetas Serron—declares that Simon talked of both Βυθὸς and Σιγὴ, yet the evidence of what are, presumably, the sorcerer's own words, is opposed to this assertion. Theodoret describes Simon's nonsense similarly, as far as regards this pair of powers; only, like Irenæus, he puts Ἔννοια for Σιγή. And yet he brings in Ἔννοια a second time, as springing, with Φωνὴ, from Νοῦς and Ἐπίνοια. For this second Ἔννοια we must read Ὄνομα.

Simon's Ἐπίνοια thus appears to become, with Valentine, Ἔννοια; only the latter is, now, mother of Νοῦς, instead of mate. Ἔννοια has, here, however, another name, Σιγὴ; which is, with Simon, the appellation of the source of Ἐπίνοια. But Simon's Σιγὴ—otherwise called Πῦρ?—has no obvious partner, to serve as prototype to the paramour Βυθός. In other words, Simon starts with a monad, while Valentine sets out with a duad. Valentine's theory, in producing the world, at the outset, by generation, is, therefore, in one respect, nearer the Sánkhya than is that of Simon; who, to every appearance, maintains a twofold effluence, prior to any process of procreation. The Sánkhya first begets, and then introduces evolution.

For Simon Magus's μεγάλη δύναμις, see the Acts of the Apostles, VIII., 10. In the homilies ascribed to Clement of Rome, the expression "great power of God," as applied, by Simon, to himself, receives the following turn: Σίμων, ὀριστερὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις ὤν, καὶ τῶν τὸν Θεὸν οὐκ εἰδότων ἐπὶ κακοποιΐᾳ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔχων. Clementis Romani quae feruntur Homiliae Viginti, ed. Dressel: Gottingae, 1853: p. 174. Simon's δύναμις cannot but remind the Sanskrit scholar of the Hindu *s'akti*. But the former term was applied to either sex, whereas the other is restricted to females.

Dr. Mill, in connection with the remark lately cited, puts forward a statement touching one of the fundamentals of Hinduism, which, as coming

Áchárya's controversial adventures,—a romance which unquestioning credulity has affiliated on Ánanda Giri,—the great Vedántic doctor is represented as having been confronted, in the course of his rambles, by only a single Sánkhya, one Lakshmaṇa. Though the heretic would, of course, eventually succumb, it yet cost his doughty opponent, in this instance, but few words to boast a new pervert.*

In preparing the present publication for the press, I employed, for the body of the work, three manuscripts, which agreed among themselves to such a degree as to occasion little doubt or dif-

---

* Nor was S'ankara here constrained, in order to enforce his creed, to appeal to the argument of his disciples' staves and sandals: a mode of propagandism to which, on the word of his biographer, he was, at all times, sufficiently prone to have recourse.

The author of the *S'ankara-dig-vijaya,* unscrupulous fabler as he was, has yet described the Sánkhya theory with sufficient accuracy. It is difficult to say whether he is equally exact in his account of the ascendancy which it had acquired, in his day, among its professors.

S'ankara's argumentation with Lakshmaṇa can readily be imagined; but Lakshmaṇa's confession of faith, being brief, shall be adduced. It purports to be borrowed, and is as follows:

गुणसाम्यं प्रधानं हि महत्तत्त्वादिकारणम् ।
अव्यक्तं व्य भावं च गत्येकं परात् परम् ॥ इति ॥
तदुपासनमात्रेण मुक्तिः सन्निहिता नृणाम् ।
कपिलादिभिराचार्य्यैराहृतं योगमुत्तमम् ॥ इति ॥

'The chief one—*or primeval nature*—is the equilibrium of the three qualities; the source of the great principle, *or intelligence,* and of the rest *of the derivative material principles;* undiscernible, *as cause;* also discernible, *in its products;* singular in the world, superior to what—*viz*, *intelligence*—is *itself* superior, *in a descending series.*

'Through the mere worship thereof do men attain salvation, *and* Kapila and other teachers engaged in the most exalted contemplation.'

The latter couplet, if not a forgery, is scarcely in accord with M. Saint-Hilaire's assertion: "Le Bouddhisme est devenu une religion; et c'est un but que n'a jamais poursuivi l'école du Sânkhya." Premier Mémoire sur le Sânkhya, p. 4.

ficulty. None of them had a date; and they all wore a modern appearance. For correctness they were respectable. As the last pages of the sixth Book were passing through the printer's hands, two other manuscripts were obtained. One was undated; the other was transcribed in the Samvat year 1711, or A. D. 1654. They discovered few blemishes; but, while presenting, throughout, a great similarity to one another, they differed, in many respects, from my earlier materials. Full particulars of these discrepancies will be found in the Appendix. This, for the benefit of Hindu students, I have given in Sanskrit; but in a style so simple that no European who has passed his novitiate in the classical language of India, will have reason to complain that it was not written in English. In this Appendix I have, also, frequently referred to Aniruddha's and Mahádeva's readings of the aphorisms. Of these sentences, unaccompanied by commentary, I had two excellent manuscripts. To ascertain the sentences the more completely, I likewise collated three very accurate copies of Nágesʹa Bhaṭṭa's abstract of my author's text. Nágesʹa cites the aphorisms at length.*

For the tedious array of emendations which deform the con-

---

* The first edition of the *Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya* bears the imprint of Serampore, 1821: 8vo. pp. 220. This seems to be the publication announced as having been projected by "Mr. Carey and his assistants," under the auspices of the Council of Fort William, and the Asiatic Society of Bengal. See Roebuck's Annals of the College of Fort William, p. 157. The faults of that impression need not now be made the subject of minute recital A characteristic sample of them may be seen in the foot-note at the bottom of pp. 21—24 supra. The editors of the volume had the advantage of a manuscript, or manuscripts, much superior to the use they made of their appliances Several of the longer additional passages which I derived from my codices last procured, and which will be found in the Appendix, occur in the Serampore edition also

In 1852, Dr. Ballantyne published the first fasciculus of "The Aphorisms of the Sánkhya Philosophy of Kapila, with Illustrative Extracts from the Commentaries." It was followed, in 1854, by a second fasciculus, completing the fourth Book.

clusion of the volume, I plead my distance from the press, and the brittleness of Anglo-Indian type- etal.*

A Bangálí translation of the *Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya,* entitled *Sánkhya-bháshá-sangraha,* was undertaken by Rámajaya Tarkálankára Bhaṭṭáchárya, son of Mṛityunjaya. So, at least, the work itself sets forth: but the Friend of India Magazine for 1823, No. VIII., p. 567. makes them to be joint translators; and adds that they were, the last-named in succession to the other, "chief pandits in the Supreme Court." Mṛityunjaya, surnamed Vidyálankára, had previously been head pandit in the College of Fort William. This version conforms very closely to the Serampore edition of the original, from which, while still unpublished, it appears to have been prepared. How much of this translation was executed, or how much of it was printed, I am unable to say. All that I have seen of it is a fragment of 168 octavo pages, breaking off, abruptly, in the midst of the commentary on the eighty-ninth Aphorism of the first Book—according to my numbering. The volume was published at Serampore, in 1818. It opens with a short preface in Sanskrit; and it gives the *sútras* in the original language, and in large characters.

At Benares I have seen, in manuscript, a prose translation, in the provincial dialect, of the *Sánkhya-sútra* and of Vijnána's exposition in abstract. The author was Áhitágni Rakshapála Dúbe; who also showed me Hindí versions, made by himself, on a like model, of the Yoga, Nyáya, Vais'eshika, Vedánta, and Mímánsá, Aphorisms, and of S'áṇḍilya's Sentences on Devotion. Each of these translations was accompanied, like the *Sánkhya-sútra,* by a Hindí gloss, abridged from the Sanskrit.

* A more thorough search for defects than that which resulted in the list of errata at the end of the volume, has yielded the following additional ones:

P.	l.	For	read	P.	l.	For	read
85	21	-कार्याणा	- र्याणां	161	21	मनना-	नुना-
126	23	-त्यक्त	-त्यु म्	165	15	गतव्य-	ग व्य-
129	9	-ङ्गीकारे	-ङ्गीकारे	203	2	पूर्वत्	पूर्ववत्
147	5	-द्विविधः	-द् द्विविधः	210	13	-श्चर्ह	—
156	7	-तद्दका-	-तद्दि ा-	232	1	क्कर-	क्रूर-
			Appendix.				
25	20	ा ा-	नत्वा-	40	22	पतिद्द-	परिद्द-
37	21	-	नन्वे-	41	1	चति	चेति
38	25	- ास	- ासु	42	25	-ङ्गाष्य	-ङ्गाष्ये

In bringing out this work, I have received assistance, in various ways, from Pandits Kás'ínátha Sástrí Ashṭaputre Púnekar, Bechan Tiwárí, Bálakṛishṇa S'ástrí Khandakar, and Viṭṭhala S'ástrí Jos'í A'mbuvekar. To each and to all I offer my grateful acknowledgements.

Ajmere, Rajputana; the 10th of September, 1855.

ADDITIONS AND EMENDATIONS.

P. 1, notes, last line. For "*niris'wara*" read "*nirís'wara*." The passage here intended will be found at the sixth page of the present work.

P. 2, notes, l. 1. For "corresponding" read "corresponding, in some measure."

P. 2, notes, l. 4. For "साङ्ख्य" read "साङ्ख्या."

P. 2, notes, ll. 20 and 26. For "साङ्ख्या:" and "*sánkhyáh*" read "सङ्ख्याः" and "*sankhyáh*."

P. 9, notes, l. 7. Add references to the English translation of the *Rig-veda*, Vol. I., p. 235, foot-note; and Vol. II, pp. 36 and 90, foot-notes. Also see, for a view adverse to that hastily expressed by the writer, the *Nirukta*, *Daivata-káṇḍa*, 6, 7: p. 171 of Roth's edition.

P. 9, notes, l. 21. The *S'abda-kalpa-druma*, pp. 1831-2, cites the fiftieth chapter of the *Vámana-puráṇa*, as making Sanatkumára, Sanátana, Sanaka, and Sanandana, children of Dharma and Hinsá. What follows, respecting Kapila, Voḍhu, A'suri, and Panchas'ikha, is not altogether clear.

P. 9, notes, l. 24. In the *Bhágavata-puráṇa*, I., 3, 11, Kapila is spoken of as having only revived the Sánkhya. From the same work, IX, 8, 14, it appears, however, to be asserted that he originated it. The ensuing couplet, from the last section of the *Padma-puráṇa*, is to the same effect:

श्वेतद्वीपपतिः साङ्ख्यप्रणेता सर्वसिद्धिराट् ।
विश्वप्रकाशितज्ञानयोगो मोहतमिस्रहा ॥

Vishṇu-vyúha-bheda-varṇana chapter.

A Hindu would harmonize these discordant assertions by assuming that they point to events of two several stages of the world's history.

P. 10, notes, l. 22. If Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol I., pp. 230, 231—means to intimate that, in Gaudapáda's commentary, Pancha-s'ikha is said to be Kapila's disciple, either directly, or through A'suri, the assertion is an oversight. That A'suri was Panchas'ikha's preceptor is de-

clared in the seventieth *káriká;* but on this couplet Gaudapáda makes no remark.

P. 11, notes, l. 14. For "3" read "4."

P. 12, notes, l. 3. Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 231—speaks of the passage given at the bottom of p. 10 supra, and referred to at p. 17 infra, as being one of Panchas'ikha's *sútras.* But it is not so discriminated by Vyása, nor by Vyása's commentators, though they name Panchas'ikha as its author. Colebrooke, it is evident, did not suspect that reference was anywhere made to more than one work of this ancient writer.

P. 12, notes, l. 25. Gaudapáda cites this couplet twice. On one occasion he reads "*vaset*" for "*sthitah.*" The same distich is quoted by Cháritra Sinha Gani, in his commentary on the *Shad-dars'ana-samuchchaya.*

P. 12, notes, last line. For "*papmá*" read "*pápmá.*"

P. 14, notes, l. 8. Of this passage the words अपरिणामिनी भोक्तृशक्तिः are adduced as Panchas'ikha's, in the concluding chapter of the *Sarva-dars'ana-sangraha.*

P. 15, notes, l. 22. For "propitiation-service" read "satisfaction-service." The former term rather translates *s'ánti,* a very common office of religion, among the Hindus.

P. 15, notes, l. 31. In place of "Rudra" there are preferable grounds for conjecturing "Ribhu." See the Translation of the *Vishnu-purána,* p. 38.

P. 17, notes, l. 24. Elsewhere, however, it is denied that Kapila was son of Kardama, by Devahúti; another and later wife of the patriarch, of unspecified name, being the sage's mother. As to Devahúti, she is represented as the daughter, not of Manu Sváyambhuva,—as is ordinarily declared,—but of Trinabindu. The original of these statements is expressed in the following words:

धर्मदत्त उवाच ।
जयस्य विजयस्यैव विष्णोर्द्वाःस्थौ महाश्रुतौ ।
किन्तु ताभ्यां पुरा चीर्णं यस्मात् तद्रूपधारिणौ ॥ १ ॥
गणावूचतुः ।
तृणबिन्दोस्तु कन्यायां देवहूत्यां पुरा द्विज ।
कर्दमस्य तु दृष्ट्वैव पुत्रौ द्वौ सम्बभूवतुः ॥ २ ॥
ज्येष्ठो जयः कनिष्ठोऽभूद् विजयश्चेति नामतः ।
अन्यस्यामभवत् पश्चात् कपिलो योगधर्मवित् ॥ ३ ॥

Padma-purána, Pátála-khanda, 97th chapter.

P. 20, notes, l. 6. For "*Gaurí-varnana*" read "*Gaurí-viváha-varnana.*"

P. 20, notes, l. 8. For "Kalápa"—which should have been "Kalpa"—read "Indraprastha."

P. 20, notes, l. 15. The *Kapila-gítá*, in a detached form, has also been found. It professes to be a part of the *Padma-puráṇa*, and is concerned with the practices of the *yoga*, or theocrasy.

P. 21, notes, l. 24. For "Nagojí" read "Nágojí."

P. 26, notes, l. 21. According to Colebrooke, the Pás'upatas—like the followers of Mis'ra—maintain "the distinct and separate existence of the efficient and material causes of the universe." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 407, 409, and 412.

P. 26, notes, l. 26. The author of the *Shat-tantrí-sára* proves to be no other than the *Nílakaṇṭha* who annotated the *Mahábhárata*, and wrote the *Vedánta-kataka*. His parents were Govinda and Phullámbiká; his line was that of Gautama; his family name was Chaturdhara; and he resided at Kúrpara, now Koñpar, in Maháráshtra, to the west of the Godávarí, near the temples of S'ukres'wara and Kaches'wara. A man who calls himself grandson of this Nílakaṇtha, is now living at Benares.

Govinda Díkshita—the Govinda above mentioned, or some other, but of the Chaturdhara family—was father of S'iva Díkshita, author of the *Dharma-tattwa-prakás'a*, the date of which is S'aka 1668, or A. D. 1746.

P. 27, notes, l. 15. For "विपर्थय:" read "विपर्यय:"

P. 28, notes, l. 12. For "-हङ्गारो" read "-हङ्कारो."

P. 33, notes, l. 5. For "Ashṭaputra" read "Ashtaputre."

P. 33, notes, l. 6. For "Rájá" read "Rája" Correct similarly at p. 36, notes, l. 23; and at p. 37, notes, l. 30.

P. 34, notes, l. 15. The Jainas affect to have their own Sánkhyas, Mímánsakas, &c. Mackenzie Collection, Vol. II., p. xxxvi.

P. 34, notes, l. 29. The author of the *Tattwa-chandra* gives the title of *Muni* to I's'wara Krishna, and distinctly calls him disciple of Panchas'ikha.

P. 35, notes, l. 2. For "Dúrgá" read "Durgá."

P. 35, notes, l. 9. The use of aliases is by no means infrequent among Hindu authors. Though not, generally, of much interest, one occurs to me, which seems worth recording. Like the run of facts connected with Indian history, it has no better support, however, than the unwritten tradition of the schools.

Jayadeva, the author of the *Gíta-govinda*, is said to have been the same person as Pakshadhara Mis'ra, the dialectician. Report has it that his custom was to attend his Nyáya teacher no oftener than once a fortnight, and that he owed to this fact his title of Pakshadhara. Quite possibly this is mere fiction; and it may have had its origin, partially, in the circumstance that there was a logician Jayadeva, who is spoken of as having been likewise a poet. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., p. 51, l. 5; and its Appendix, p. 161.

Professor Lassen—*Gíta-govinda*, Prolegomena, p. v.—, for want of an opportunity to examine the *Chandráloka*, is in doubt whether the Jayadeva to whom it is attributed be identifiable with the lyric poet of the same name. The question is one of no difficult decision.

The Jayadeva of the *Chandráloka* was, by his own showing, son of Mahádeva, surnamed Yájnika, and of Sumitrá. Jayadeva, the author of the *Prasannarághava* drama, particularizes the same persons as his parents, and further states that his family was denominated Kauṇḍinya. Whether the *Chandráloka*, a dry technical treatise, was the production of the writer of the *Gíta-govinda*, could scarcely be ascertained by comparing the necessarily different styles of the two compositions. The *Prasanna-rághava* is, however, every way inferior, in respect of language and general execution, to the elegant Lays of Govinda; and there is no ground on which the position may be controverted, that the rhetorician and the play-wright were the same individual.

Internal evidence even is quite sufficient to determine the point under consideration, independently of the discrepancy offered in the accounts given, severally, of their extraction, by the rhetorician and dramatist, and by the author of the *Gíta-govinda*. Moreover, if, following Lassen, we account as spurious the stanza with which this collection of poems, according to many manuscripts, terminates, we are left without any notice whatever, by its author, of his parentage. And why, if the *Chandráloka* and *Prasanna-rághava* were also his, should he have consigned to them a specification which he has denied to his foremost performance?

The couplet above mentioned, which Professor Lassen presumes to be forged, is objected to, by him, on the assumption that the Bhojadeva whom Jayadeva is made, by it, to name as his father, must be the sovereign of Dhárá. But Bhojadeva or Bhojarája is by no means an appellation of unique incidence More than one chieftain is certainly known to have borne it; and it has not yet been shown that, among persons so called, the grammarian, for instance, has any claim to be regarded as a royal patron rather than as an actual maker of books. In a word, it is not imperative to take such a termination as *deva* or *rája* to be indicative of rank. It may be part of a name; as in Varadarája, Govindarája, Jayadeva, and Harshadeva.

The name of Jayadeva's mother is written, by Lassen, Rámádeví. My own manuscripts have Vámadeví Jayadeva's father is called Bhojadeva, by the Bráhman Ráychand, in his metrical Hindí translation of the *Gíta-govinda*, the *Gíta-govindádars'a*.

It remains to speak of the *Ráma-gíta-govinda*, a poem on the incongruity of whose title Lassen justly animadverts. *Gíta-govinda*, Prolegomena, p. VI. This wretched affair purports to have, for its author, one Jayadeva,

of Janakapura. So much the poetaster himself tells us; and I know not on what authority Professor Wilson—Mackenzie Collection, Vol. I., p. 103—concludes him to be one with the poet of Rádhá and Krishna. The subject of the *Ráma-gíta-govinda* is that of the *Rámáyaṇa*. Its extent is 360 couplets; divided into six cantos, which bear the designations of *Sánanda-raghunandana*, *Vijita-paras'uráma*, *Jagannivása-pravása*, *Hanumad-ágamana*, *Lanká-vijaya*, and *Ráma-rájábhisheka*.

P. 35, notes, l. 31. S'ankara, it should seem, has wildly been assigned to the eighth century before the Christian era. See Mr. B H. Hodgson's Illustrations of the Literature and Religion of the Buddhists, p. 18, foot-note.

P. 35, notes, l 34. The notion that Gaudapáda was pupil of S'uka, the son of Vyása, is generally received by the Bráhmans. See, for this association, Colebrooke's reference to the *S'ankara-vijaya*: Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 104.

Gangádhara Saraswati, author of the *Dattátreya-charitra*, a metrical composition in the Marahattí language, deduces his own discipular descent, through S'uka and Gauḍapáda, from S'iva, as follows: S'ankara, Vishṇu, Brahmá, Vasishtha, S'akti, Parás'ara, Vyása, S'uka, Gaudapáda A'chárya, Govinda A'chárya, S'ankara A'chárya, Vis'warúpa, Bodha Giri, Jnána Giri, Sinhála Giri, I's'wara Tírtha, Nṛisinha Tírtha, Vidyá Tírtha, S'iva Tírtha, Bhárati Tírtha, Vidyáraṇya, S'rípáda, Vidyá Tírtha, Malayánanda, Deva Tírtha, Vṛinda Saraswati, Yádavendra Saraswati, Kṛishṇa Saraswati, Nṛisinha Saraswati, and Gangádhara Saraswati. Gangádhara had seven fellow-students, all bearing the title of Saraswati: Bála, Kṛishṇa, Upendra, Mádhava, Sadánanda, Jnánajyoti, and Siddhendra.

The *Mitákshará*, a commentary on the *Brahma-sútra*, by Annam Bhaṭṭa, son of Tirumala, contains a list, identical, down to S'ankara A'charya, with the foregoing; except that Vasishṭha is preceded by Brahma and Brahmá.

Gauḍapáda, it appears credible, belongs to the very precinct of the age of fable.

P. 36, notes, l 9. Bhánu Bhaṭṭa, in the *Dwaita-nirṇaya-siddhánta-sangraha*, speaks of the author of a treatise having the name of *Dwaita-nirṇaya*, as being his paternal grandfather. But his own work, which cites it, proves that he does not mean the *Dwaita-nirṇaya* of Váchaspati Mis'ra. Bhánu Bhaṭṭa's parents were Nílakaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa and Gangá. The title of Bhaṭṭa is borne by Mímánsakas

P 36, notes, l. 29 The *Ratnákara*, compiled under the patronage of Chaṇdes'wara, embraces at least seven sections, entitled *Kṛitya*, *Dana*, *Vyavahára*, *S'uddhi*, *Pújá*, *Viváda*, and *Gṛihastha*. Of these, Váchaspati

he was assisted, in preparing it, by Ananta Díkshita, son of Vis'wanátha Díkshita. The father of Bhává Ganes'a Díkshita was Bhává Vis'wanátha Díkshita; and, if the latter be one with Vis'wanátha Díkshita, and if Bhává Gaṇes'a Díkshita be brother of Ananta Díkshita, we are enabled to form a pretty correct estimate as to the time of Vijnána Bhikshu. For Náráyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's youngest brother's second son, Raghunátha Bhaṭṭa, dates his *Kála-tattwa-vivechana* in Samvat 1677, or A. D. 1620. Vijnána may be placed fifty or sixty years earlier.

P 48, l. 1. Cancel the sentence "To the end," &c.

P. 50, notes, l. 1. Substitute as follows: The words *vikrita* 'modified' and *vaikárika* 'modificational,' as synonymes of *sáttwika* 'pure,' must be taken to denote, by eminence, the highest of the three egotistic transmutations of nature; these being held to result from that disturbance in the equipoise of its ingredients, by virtue of which it becomes eductive. Misapprehending the retrospective reference of the term *vikṛita*, in the twenty-fifth *káriká*, M Saint Hilaire describes 'pure' egotism as almost being at once a modification and not a modification.

Egotism, at the very instant of its emanation, assumes three distinct shapes. It would, accordingly, preclude doubt, if the particular sort of egotism had in contemplation were always characterized by its special epithet. Of egotism divested of qualifications the Sánkhya teaches us nothing.

There is no such thing in the scheme.

P. 55, notes, l. 21. A passage in Hippolytus which runs counter to this statement, escaped my notice. Having premised the names of Valentine, Heracleon, and Ptolemæus, Hippolytus proceeds in these words: Καὶ γὰρ τούτων ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τῶν πάντων μονὰς ἀγέννητος, ἄφθαρτος, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀπερινόητος, γόνιμος, καὶ πάντων τῆς γενέσεως αἰτία τῶν γενομένων. Omnium Hæresium Refutatio, ed. Miller, p. 185.

BIBLIOTHECA INDICA;

A COLLECTION OF ORIENTAL WORKS,

PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF THE

Hon. Court of Directors of the East India Company,

AND THE SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE

A AT C C TY A.

A T WO

The ELEMENTS OF POLITY, by KÁMANDAKI. Edited by Bábu RÁJENDRALÁL MITTRA. Already published, Fasciculus I. being No. 19.

The LALITA VISTARA, or Memoirs of the Life and Doctrines of SÁKYA SINHA. Edited by Bábu RÁJENDRALÁL MITTRA. Already published, Fasciculi I. and II. Nos. 51 and 73.

The Prákrita Grammar of Kr adíswara. dited by Bábu RÁJENDRALÁL MITTRA.

An English translation of the CHHÁNDOGYA UPANISHAD of the Sáma Veda, By Bábu RÁJENDRALÁL MITTRA. Already published, Fasciculus I. No. 78.

The SARVADARSANA SANGRAHA; or an Epitome of the different systems of Indian Philosophy. By MÁDHAVÁCHÁRYA. Edited by Pandita I's'WARACHANDRA VIDYÁSÁGARA. Already published, Fasciculus I. No. 63.

The VEDÁNTA SÚTRAS. Edited by DR. ROER, Published, Fasciculi I. and II. Nos. 64 and 89.

The TAITTIRÍYA SANHITÁ of the Black Yajur Veda. Edited by Dr. E. RÖER. Published, Fasciculi I. II. III. IV. V. VI. VII. and VIII. Nos. 92, 117, 119, 122, 131, 133, 134, and 137.

The TAITTIRYÍA BRÁHMANA of the Black Yajur Veda. Edited by Bábu RÁJENDRALÁL MITTRA. Published, Fasciculi I. and II. Nos. 125 and 126.

The SÚRYA-SIDDHÁNTA, with its Commentary the Gúdhártha-prakás'aka. Edited by FITZ-EDWARD HALL, A. M. Already published, Fasciculi I. II. and III. Nos. 79, 105 and 115.

The TALE OF VÁSAVADATTA', by SUBANDHU, with its Commentary entitled Darpana. Edited by FITZ-EDWARD HALL, A. M. Published, Fasciculi I. and II. Nos. 116 and 130.

The MA'RKANDEYA PURA'NA. Edited by K. M. BANNERJEA, already published, Fasciculi I. II. and III. Nos. 114, 127 and 140.

* For a list of the Persian and Arabic works in progress, See No. 130 of the Bibliotheca India.

WORK PU LI HED.

	Former Price.	Reduced Price.
The first two Lectures of the Sanhita of the Rig Véda, with the Commentary of Mádhava Áchárya, and an English translation of the text. Edited by Dr E. Roer, Nos. 1 to 4, ...	4 0 0	2 8 0
The Brihad Áranyaka Upanishad, with the Commentary of S'ankara Áchárya, and the Gloss of Ánanda Giri. Edited by Dr. E. Roer, Nos. 5 to 13, 16 and 18, ...	11 0 0	6 14 0
An English Translation of the above Upanishad and Commentary. Nos. 27, 38 and 135, ...	3 0 0	1 14 0
The Chhándogya Upanishad, with the Commentary of S'ankara Áchárya, and the Gloss of Ánanda Giri. Edited by Dr. E. Roer, Nos. 14, 15, 17, 20, 23 and 25, ...	6 0 0	3 12 0
The Taittiríya, Aittaréya and S'wétás'watara Upanishads with Commentary, &c. Nos. 22, 33, and 34, ...	3 0 0	1 14 0
The Ís'á, Kéna, Katha, Pras'na, Mundaka, and Mándukya Upanishads, with Commentary, &c. Edited by Dr. E. Roer, Nos. 24, 26, 28, 29, 30 and 31, ...	6 0 0	3 12 0
The Tittiriya, Aittaréya, S'wétás'watara, Kéna, Ís'á, Katha, Pras'na, Mundaka and Mándukya Upanishads. Translated from the Original Sanskrit, by Dr. E. Roer, Nos. 41 and 50, ...	2 0 0	1 4 0
Division of the Categories of the Nyáya Philosophy, with a Commentary and an English Translation, by Dr. E. Roer, Nos. 32 and 35, ...	2 0 0	1 4 0
The Sáhitya-Darpana or Mirror of Composition, by Viswanáth Kavirája, edited by Dr. E. Roer, Nos 36, 37, 53, 54 and 55, ...	5 0 0	3 2 0
The Chaitanya Chandrodaya Nátaka of Kavikarnapura. Edited by Bábu Rájendralál Mittra, Nos. 47, 48 and 80, ...	3 0 0	1 14 0
The UTTARA NAISHADA CHARITA, by SRI HARSA, with the Commentary of Náráyana Edited by DR. E. ROER Fasciculi I. II. III. IV. V. VI. VII. VIII. IX. X. XI. and XII. Nos. 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 52, 67, 72, 87, 90, 120, 123 and 124, ...	12 0 0	7 8 0
The SÁNKHYA-PRAVACHANA-BHÁSHYA. Edited by Fitz-Edward Hall, A. M., and to be translated by J. R Ballantyne, LL. D. Fasciculi I. II. and III., being Nos. 94, 97 and 141, ...	0 0 0	1 4 0